he Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., Litt.D.

Editorial Board:
L. MANNING, M.A. | Rev. ARTHUR PRINGLE.
. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D. | Rev. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
Mr. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions ed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

Congregational Quarterly is published on the 20th of March, June, ber, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the gational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the ers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any ller at 2s. 6d.

contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at , Russell Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex, with stamped envelope for return in case -acceptance.

VIII, No. 3 JULY, 1930.

CONTENTS.

[*For biographical sketches of the contributors see p. xv.*]

ORIAL		257
PERMANENT ELEMENT IN APOCALYPTIC	H. H. Farmer	265
R DAYS	John R. Legge	279
UM'S UNIVERSAL ROBOTS	T. W. Bevan	285
PERSON OF CHRIST	Sydney Cave	298
N BOOK REFORM	Rendel Harris	305
NTIFIC CHRISTIANITY	E. Cunningham	313
ADVANTAGES OF BEING A MISSIONARY	W. Kendall Gale	320
ELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—		
HE INTERNATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL	J. D. Jones	325
HE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA	D. L. Ritchie	329
OWARDS A FREE CHURCH LECTIONARY	J. Arnold Quail	337
OYS AND PRAYERS	Eric Gordon	340
GREGATIONAL STATEMENTS—		
HE NATURE OF THE CHURCH	C. Ernest Watson	343
UR MINISTRY AND REUNION	Roderic Dunkerley	347
IFE AND BOOKS—		
WEEK OFF	Albert Peel	351
EIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS—		
MERICA REVISITED	W. B. Selbie	354
LD AND NEW FRIENDS IN GERMANY	J. P. Naish	357
EVIEW	R. S. Franks	363
RENT LITERATURE. By the Editor, Drs. J. P. Naish, R. S. Franks, . Mackintosh, the Revs. E. R. Micklem, M.A. and J. G. McKenzie, .A., B.D.		365
RTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST. By the Editor and the Rev. . T. S. James, B.A., M.Sc.		379
ODICAL PUBLICATIONS		398
RESPONDENCE. Dr. C. J. Cadoux and the Rev. A. D. Martin		400

(*Made and Printed in Great Britain.*)

WORKING IN **82** EVERY CLIME

The SALVATION ARMY spreads its MESSAGE in 82 COUNTRIES

THE SALVATION ARMY IS LISTENING! Listening for the cry of the helpless, and responding in eighty-two countries of the world. Wherever there are starving, wherever poverty rules, wherever suffering is rife, the "Army of the Helping Hand" extends its Message of Hope. A practical work of Salvation is being rendered throughout the Motherland, in the Dominions, in India, on the Continent, in China and Japan, in the African Bush, in the Leper Swamps of Java, ... IN EVERY LAND.

THE SALVATION ARMY *maintains* General, Eye and Maternity Hospitals in Africa, India, China, Japan, Dutch East Indies;

ministers to the Lepers in Java, India and Sumatra;

extends its help to every class irrespective of creed. To the needy of the slums, the "down-and-out," the betrayed, the criminal . . . the Salvationist dedicates his or her life;

is the greatest Temperance Organisation in the world, and its work of combating the evils of Alcoholic excess is never-ceasing.

THE MOTHERS' HOSPITAL which is conducted by the Salvation Army, is the largest Maternity Hospital in England.

No less than 25,000 Officers and over 111,000 unpaid Local Officers, or lay workers, are engaged in the spiritual and social ministrations of the Salvation Army.

SALVATION ARMY

Contributions gratefully acknowledged by GENERAL HIGGINS, 101 Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C. 4.

The Friend of Numberless needs Numberless Friends

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

ERY day we anxiously await the news from India, fearing lest the ation will be entirely out of hand before the Simon Report has n digested. It would be a tragedy if, when the British Governnt is in the hands of those with every sympathy with Indian irations, the clock should be put back by outbreaks of violence nanding more and more repression in the name of order. The lian papers that reach us help to an understanding of the situation, ugh they are far from hopeful. *The Guardian,* a Christian weekly m Calcutta, says

> " We believe that the country stands to lose both from the continuance of Mr. Gandhi's campaign and from the continuance of Government's policy of repression. Surely there are some statesmen left in India among both the Government and the Liberals who can find means to bring about a peaceful solution of the present deadlock.

l the same it insists that something must be done to bring Dominion atus within present policy, and not leave it merely as a distant goal. en this paper has strong things to say about British rule :

> " After 150 years of broken promises it is impossible for any British Government to re-establish by words that faith and confidence in the minds of the Indian people and the only way out of the difficulty is for the British Government to give to India the machinery by which she herself will be in a position to advance towards full Dominion Status. What India asks for to-day are deeds and not words".

e pray that the Simon Report will point the way to an agreed lution which will give to India peace and freedom.

* * *

The Lambeth Conference and the International Congregational uncil meet in the near future. It is to be hoped that they will not ncern themselves with purely domestic matters, but will speak out ldly so that a lead may be given to all the nations represented in e direction of peace and disarmament.

We give a warm welcome to Congregational representatives from erseas, and trust that, for them and for ourselves, the Council may ve an inspiration and the beginning of a revival of religion in our urches. We share the view expressed within by Dr. J. D. Jones at the International Congregational Movement is on trial at this, e 5th Council : only if it is made the means of real deliberation gether and a free interchange of ideas can it be said to serve its rpose.

* * *

THE Lambeth Conference, it is clear, will have no easy task when it faces the question of union, especially in regard to South India. The *Modern Churchman* says that the Conference cannot give unanimous support to the proposals, probably having in mind the strong opposition of the Anglo-Catholics. From all sides comes a good deal of propaganda. Dr. Sparrow Simpson puts the Anglo-Catholic view in *South India Schemes* (S.P.C.K., 5s.), in which he several times refers to our own views, while Bishop Palmer and Bishop Gore have chapters for and against in the *Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Lausanne Findings* (Church House, Westminster, 3s.) every word of which ought to be carefully studied.

* * *

DR. Sparrow Simpson devotes a chapter of his book to the Bishop of Gloucester, in whose attitude, as a moderating Bishop of great influence, we are intensely interested. In many places he is now insisting on the impossibility of the Anglo-Catholic belief in apostolic succession. Thus, in the *Church Quarterly Review:*

> "The Anglo-Catholic theory of the ministry held in its most rigid form . . . originated largely from the imperfect historical knowledge of the Tractarians. It does not harmonize with the early history of the ministry nor with the spiritual facts of the present day. Moreover it presents a serious barrier to Christian Reunion in any form and in particular to the general acceptance of Episcopacy. I believe—and I find that there are many in many different religious bodies who share the belief with me—that the only basis for any stable form of Church unity is Episcopacy. The tendency among those who think about such things is more and more to accept that basis, but the claims put forward on its behalf and the form in which the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is taught have the effect of alienating many and make our work much more difficult".

Again, in *Christian Unity* (S.C.M., 4s.) he writes:

> "I believe, then, that re-union should take place on the basis of the historic episcopate and episcopal consecration and ordination and on a recognition of an interim period when inter-celebration should only be allowed by direct episcopal licence".

The Bishop ought to be warned that episcopacy, even without apostolic succession, would have to be carefully defined and regulated before many Free Churchmen would even begin to consider it.

While we welcome the Bishop's words in this volume, and elsewhere, about apostolic succession, nevertheless we are frankly bewildered both by the matter and the manner of much of the book. In religious controversy have we not got beyond the unmannerliness which refers to one who differs from us as "a certain Dr. Ainslie"?

The Bishop, like Dr. J. K. Mozley, in an article quoted within, insists on the importance of baptism: "The Church consists of all *baptised* Christians"; "the fundamental distinction is between a heathen and a Christian, between those who are baptised and those

are not baptised". Here, of course, we cannot follow, nor do we w what to make of "either to add or to forbid anything as part of Christian Faith is really contrary to that Faith", there being in tence "a Catholic Faith and a Catholic Creed, of which it may aid that they have been always and at all times and in all places eved". Further, inter-communion is unreal, "pretending to be and we are not one", and as communion is "the great act of istian brotherhood", inter-communion seems to some "irreverent, ost perhaps a little blasphemous", while it is intolerant for any to that the refusal of communion is an unchristian act.

It will thus be seen that even a moderating Bishop is far from roaching the views commonly held by Free Churchmen : but can e wondered at when he believes that "The Congregationalist gnizes only the body of Christians to which he himself belongs" ?

* * *

OKING back to the "May meetings" forces us to recognize how ing are the impressions left by a crowded series of gatherings. m Dr. Norwood came a characteristic Chairman's Address, with rences to the failure of the Naval Conference which ought to be ven home to the Governments concerned by the International ncil, the Lambeth Conference, and every representative religious embly. The Rev. W. Charter Piggott's election to the Chair of Union is an honour well deserved by one who has rendered ling service to the denomination in the churches to which he has istered and in many other ways.

One thing we are constrained to say : surely it is not beyond gregationalism's ingenuity to find some better way of transacting ominational business. To rush through the Reports of a dozen ortant committees in half-an-hour is to make representative ernment by the churches through the Assembly into a farce. Two rses, not necessarily exclusive, seem to deserve consideration :

(1) Let Assembly business take precedence of all sectional gatherings. Make the Monday Assembly from 5.15 to 8.0, taking then all resolutions on public questions, and leaving the Wednesday Assembly clear for the Reports of Commissions and Committees.

(2) Let the Council, in preparing the business, suggest three or four of the Reports for special attention, and make a time-table for the discussion of each Report.

* * *

EVIEWER who has to read a dozen or so books a week is rarely ved to enthusiasm, but we would proclaim far and wide to all and dry, and especially to preachers and teachers, that *Fire Kindleth* (Blackie, 6s.), " The Autobiography of Marion Cleeve ", is a

book to read, and read with delight. It tells of Miss Cleeve's
years' experience as headmistress of " Snellham Municipal Seconda
School for Girls ", and it is as searching as it is well written. Mi
Cleeve sees humour even in the difficulties of her work, and its geni
presence livens many of her pages. On her Governors she
exceptionally good, though we wish she had told us more about t
fight with the Chairman from which she retired defeated. Whe
she was attempting to give her girls true ideas of beauty by providi
good pictures, one of the Governors suggested that portraits of t
Governors would look well in the hall—so that project came to
sudden end! Perhaps the most cutting thing in the book is contain
in the sentences: " During the quarter of a century of my headsh
I received only one sentence of commendation from any Governo
male or female, public or private. When panegyrics appeared
the local press, they made no reference to the headmistress and we
appropriated by the Chairman ".

The great value of the book lies in its revelation of a teacher wi
ideals based on true religion. The pastoral spirit in which Mi
Cleeve carried out her work should put many a minister to sham
She tried to make her school a fellowship, and to bring every gi
into it. She managed to secure confidence and even affection fro
the girls, but never let this degenerate into a harmful sentimentali

We wish we could think that the majority of our schools were le
by teachers with such a high view of their office. Miss Cleeve spea
of her joy when one of her old scholars revealed to her that the id
of spiritual radiance had been a constant companion since her mistre
had quoted Matthew Arnold's lines:—

> " O human soul, as long as thou canst so
> Set up a mark of everlasting light
> Above the howling senses' ebb and flow ".

Miss Cleeve can also have the joy of knowing that she ha
reminded many who teach from pulpit and from desk of the greatne
and grandeur of their task.

* * *

A RECENT posthumous work contains an essay on " Hymns in a Man'
Life ", which ends with the sentence, " Here is the clue to th
ordinary Englishman—in the Nonconformist hymns ". The writ
is eternally grateful for the wonder with which religious teachin
filled his childhood, for " Sun of my soul, thou Saviour dear ", fo
" Fair waved the golden corn In Canaan's pleasant land ", an
" O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness ". His ministe
avoided " sentimental messes such as ' Lead, kindly light' ", or eve
" Abide with Me ", preferring " healthy hymns " such as "At ever
ere the sun was set " and " Fight the good fight ". " Sound th
battle cry " was also a favourite:—

" Thirty-six years ago men, even Sunday School teachers, still believed in the fight for life and the fun of it. ' Hold the fort, for I am coming '. It was far, far from any militarism or gun-fighting. But it was the battle-cry of a stout soul, and a fine thing too ".

is on the whole both encouraging and true. War days proved the memory clung to hymns learnt in youth when all religious ning had been forgotten. We go on to read :—

" I think it was good to be brought up a Protestant : and among Protestants, a Nonconformist, and among Nonconformists, a Congregationalist. Which sounds pharisaic. But I should have missed bitterly a direct knowledge of the Bible, and a direct relation to Galilee and Canaan, Moab and Kedron, those places that never existed on earth. And in the Church of England one would hardly have escaped those snobbish hierarchies of class, which spoil so much for a child. And the Primitive Methodists, when I was a boy, were always having ' revivals ' and being ' saved ', and I always had a horror of being saved.

" So, altogether, I am grateful to my Congregational upbringing. The Congregationalists are the oldest Nonconformists, descendants of the Oliver Cromwell Independents. They still had the Puritan tradition of no ritual. But they avoided the personal emotionalism which one found among the Methodists when I was a boy ".

, our essayist goes on, " By the time I was sixteen I had criticised got over the Christian dogma ". His name? D. H. Lawrence! book? *Assorted Articles.*

* * *

Nonconformists to-day giving to the world hymns of the kind H. Lawrence mentions—" oak- and cedar-hearted hymns ", ry Ward Beecher called them in a letter recently printed? Is e any Congregational minister to-day who has had the joy of ing a hymn like Thomas Binney's " Eternal Light, Eternal ht "? Possibly there are hymns of this quality which have been ten and never published : the discovery of a volume of manuscript ns written by the Rev. T. G. Crippen (some of them now printed the current issue of the *Transactions of the Congregational torical Society*) inclines us to think this may be the case. If so, sooner they see the light the better, for the Church of Christ can ive few more acceptable gifts than a good hymn.

* * *

s well-known that highly organized Churches resort to vigorous paganda. Two examples are before us which need no comment. srs. Scribners have recently described the attempts made by the istian Scientists to prevent Mr. E. F. Dakin's *Mrs. Eddy* from ining a fair hearing. The sleepless activity of Christian Science paganda is notorious, and we were not surprised to receive the wing letter, dated 11th April, and signed by Mr. Charles W. J. nant, for the Committee of Publication :

crowd the records of literature, sacred and profane. Elijah after Carmel had his Ember Day. In *Ecclesiastes* the fires of faith burn low. The Pilot of the Galilean lake had His Ember week. But I need not poach on well-known preserves. I pass on to instances in contemporary life which, along with my diaries, have had place and power of suggestion on Ember Days.

Lord Salisbury, a great Anglican, read a Presbyterian minister's tract on baptism, and, as he laid it down said, "There is better stuff in the Church of Scotland just now than in the Church of England". With that testimonial I follow the bias of patriotism and give two pictures from the *Life* of Dr. Wallace Williamson, sometime minister of St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh, and ex-Moderator of the Kirk of Scotland:

> "If there was little in Thornhill to explain Williamson, there is little also in the record of his career in the University of Edinburgh. He was poor; he had to do tutoring to eke out his expenses; he had little opportunity for social functions. But, all the time, unknown to his fellows, he was living an intense life of the soul. There is a beautiful passage quoted from a diary which he kept from 1875 to 1880, written in his second year as a Divinity student, which explains better than anything else the man that he became. 'It is with a kind of tremor that I write this in the presence of my own soul and God. . . . I am now about to begin the second winter of my Divinity course, and a vision of the infinite solemnity of my duties has flashed through me. I will have to preach, if God spares me, the Gospel of Jesus to the men and women of this 19th century. God knows I am utterly unfit for it . . . O Gracious Spirit, descend and make of me a temple worthy in its poor unworthiness wherein Thou mayest dwell.' Thornhill does not explain him; the College and the Divinity Hall do not explain him; but *that* explains him. He had found the hid treasure."
>
> "The most stirring scene I ever saw in the Assembly was at a meeting of the Commission of Assembly which was to decide whether the Church would go to Parliament asking for an Act or not. A speaker suggested that the leaders had secret motives for this policy of haste. When Williamson rose to reply, his eyes glowed like red-hot embers. There was the gleam of a flame about him. The most devoted of all the lovers of the Church, it was suggested that he betrayed the Church. He ended with a classical quotation: 'Marcus Scaurus was accused by Quintus Varius Hispanus that he excited the allies to take arms against the Republic. He, full of firmness, defended himself. Marcus Scaurus denies it. There is no witness. Which do you believe, Romans?'. There was a dead silence. The eyebrows went up; the glowing eyes flashed round the hall—and he sat down. Then there rose a hurricane of applause. The minority only numbered 36; next year it was three or four. That scene, so moving, so dramatic, gave the final deathblow to the minority in the Church of Scotland."

I am content to have given the pictures. One is of the student, the other of the statesman, the first when young Williamson was conscious only of God and his own soul, the second when he had grown to be the spiritual leader of the Scottish people.

There follows an experience of Ember Days in the field of our n L.M.S. In Miss Christlieb's *An Uphill Road in India* she ys:

> "I bless Brierley ["J. B." of the *Christian World*] for the many helps he gives; his words have often been like sentinels, guarding the avenues along which resentment and discouragement and the fatal sense of futility of all effort assault the soul. *'Our Life'*, he says, *'is a continuous extraction from raw material of circumstance, of certain inner states. Shall we grumble at a world whose worst assaults are after all, opportunities for winning inner victories?'*.
>
> "These sentences have been my inspiration, this week, which has been a rather terrible one. I felt as if life had me by the hair, but helped by those words I had it by the throat."

gain:

> "Into the middle of utmost perplexity—when Dharmapalli was tottering, Andipur weakening, Bukhura unsafe, Ramedi apparently already fallen, *flashed the thought* 'Our faith is the victory', thank God, not our success (flashed also Brierley's words). Raw indeed is my material, but with it comes the chance of working at the artistry of life. Shall we grumble? Having been given these inner states the resolution to win *outward* ones seems to follow as a matter of course."

That might be entitled, "How to recover from Ember Days".

Principal Jacks has written about the lost radiancy of Christianity. piece from a leading article in the *Methodist Times* protests that

> "the Methodist churches have largely ceased to function as soul-saving institutions. The cry of the penitent is seldom heard within their walls. Conversions do not take place. The spiritual miracle has ceased to happen. What is worse, there is no expectation that it ever will happen. Sermons either are not made to convince men of sin, or so made, fail in their purpose. The plain truth is that Methodism has settled down into a church organization, and is no longer a great evangelistic movement compelling world-wide attention. The glow has gone."

The article goes on to appeal to Methodists to "fan the dying mbers into a living flame".

There will always be some who are not Fundamentalists at heart, vho may feel that some of the lustre has been bedimmed and may ncline to echo the lament of Keats:

> There was an awful rainbow once in Heaven,
> We know her warp, her texture.

Does not this about the "lost radiancy" and the "faded glow" ring to the mind *Ember Days?* Dr. Jacks and the *Methodist Times* ave a consciousness of beclouded days besetting a whole community. 'he "Day" has broadened out to be an Age, an Epoch. Ember Veeks no longer return once a quarter as in the Anglican year. They mount to an enveloping and stagnant atmosphere.

There is here material for reflexion. Did not Jesus say "Never-heless when the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on

those fourteen years which preceded the war. Unfortunately, however, the historians of the war are bound, from lack of space, to throw the maximum emphasis upon the period when England was sitting digestive in her arm chair, and when Germany, young and hungry was manifesting the unwisdom of adolescence. Before we blame Germany we must first blame our own Elizabethans. The spirit was exactly the same : the Germans, however, owing to a higher state of culture and rectitude, behaved less blatantly : and were less successful.

" I should wish, therefore, that this book, which endeavours to be objective, should be read in the light of this vital qualification. The Germans, during the period which I cover, were fired by exactly the same motives and energies which illumine what we still regard as one of the most noble passages in our early history. We, for our part, were protected against all imprudence by the repletion, passivity, and, I should add, the selfishness, of old age ".

* * *

Political prophecy is so often wide of the mark that a successful shot by the late J. B. Bury, mentioned in a Memoir by Dr. R. H. Murray, deserves to be put on record. Lecturing in 1896 on Russian troubles in the 17th century, he looked up from his notes and said :

" Gentlemen, Russia is rotten, politically rotten to the core. The period of troubles brought anarchy to Russia for generations. What has happened in the past may well happen in the future in a land where to-day not a few of the aristocracy are immoral and ruined, where there is an underpaid and corrupt bureaucracy, and where there is no middle class. In the 20th century there may be another period of troubles lasting quite as long as that of the 17th, and with even graver effects upon the destinies of the world".

* * *

In a recent Editorial we spoke of the remarkable separation of one sphere of life from another, and of the way in which men in one sphere were entirely ignorant of men who led in another. There is a striking illustration of this in Mrs. Drew's recently-published diaries. In September, 1914, she records about Kitchener :—

" Ld. B. told me he met Ld. K. at dinner and heard that when he was dining at the Londonderrys' the conversation turned on Hardy's novels and topography. ' And who may this Hardy be? ' said Ld. K. ' The man to whom H.M. gave the Order of Merit as he did to yr. Lordship ', replied Edmund Gosse".

* * *

A recent volume suggests that the Church of England can put forward a team of constructive thinkers " that would adorn any intellectual company" in the Archbishop of York, Canon Streeter, Canon Quick, Canon Raven, Father L. S. Thornton and Dr. W. R. Matthews. It is, indeed, a fine list. Can Congregationalism produce one comparable ?

* * *

[T]E PERMANENT ELEMENT IN APOCALYPTIC.

[W]EN I was trying to think out in a preliminary way the line of [th]ught which I should pursue in this article, I found myself [co]ntinually confronted with a prior question of method, which, so [lo]ng as it was not faced, seemed to render insecure any conclusions [to] which I might come. At first sight the way of advance seemed [fa]ir enough. First, I would try to say something about what might [be] called the psychology of apocalyptic, the external circumstances [an]d inner states of mind out of which apocalyptic hopes and literature [ar]ising. Then, arising out of this, I would endeavour to determine [wh]at of true spiritual perception, true apprehension of the spiritual [pow]er and of the conditions of its victory, there is in apocalyptic, and [wh]at of mere illusion, misapprehension of the facts, phantasy. [Fi]nally, I would seek to relate all this to the religious life of to-day, [fo]r only as we can see some relevance of apocalyptic to our present, [pe]rsonal experience can we speak intelligently of its permanent value. That seemed a nice, tidy, tripartite division, and I shall in a [ro]ugh way follow it. The trouble was that so soon as I began the [ac]tual business of answering these questions it became clear that it [wa]s not possible to keep them distinct from one another. I found [th]at my conclusions as to the mental processes and experiences lying [be]hind apocalyptic were being in some measure determined by my [pr]ior conviction that there is at work in it a true spiritual motive and [pe]rception; and again, on thinking it over, I found that behind that [pr]ior conviction there was to some extent the fact that I have for [so]me time felt driven by the logic of my own present-day spiritual [ex]perience, such as it is, to some sort of apocalyptic hope and [fo]rmulation of belief. It seemed then that my conclusions would [de]pend altogether too much on the quality of my own spiritual [pe]rceptions for them to be of much value. That was at first a [di]sabling thought; yet further reflexion showed that there was no [av]oiding of the disability by anybody, and that the only alternative [to] accepting it was to give up enquiry into these matters altogether. Is there then no escape from the circle of subjectivity? [Th]ere is—on one assumption only, namely, that the spiritual [ex]perience of Christian people has within it a principle of [ob]jectivity which enables them as they grow in Christian maturity [to] discriminate more and more truthfully, particularly in matters [co]ncerning Jesus Christ. The question comes, indeed, to a focus in [re]lation to Jesus Christ and to the records we have of His life, and it [is] most important that we should in this regard make clear to [ou]rselves what our presuppositions are. In this question of [ap]ocalyptic, as in other matters, we assume that Jesus is the [st]andard. Yet so far as the historical records of His life are concerned

He is quite useless as a standard unless we assume that He is ab
to reproduce in us something of His own spiritual life and perce
tions, so that in studying the Gospels, whether in relation
apocalyptic or to any other thing, we can come to true conclusio
as to the kind of person He was and the kind of thing He said, a
are not condemned to be always projecting into Him merely our ov
whims and fancies. There is no hope of escape from subjectivity
our interpretations of Jesus, our acceptances and rejections of th
that, or the other thing in the Gospel story, except on the basis o
hypothesis or faith that His Spirit is, or can be, so much the deep
thing in ourselves that seeing we may perceive and hearing we m
understand. We must posit a common Christ within before we c
launch on any enquiry into the historical Jesus with any hope
coming even ultimately to common conclusions. This seems to me
that in the end true conclusions about Christ, including His use
apocalyptic, can only be reached by the highest Christian minc
and however distasteful that may be to the so-called scient
historians, and however discouraging for ourselves, I do not see h
it can be avoided.

The same applies to the question of the origin and value of religi
generally. We must maintain that the fatal disqualification fo
really objective study of religion is to be irreligious. At the sa
time, of course, we do not suppose that the spirit of Christ wit
could, or would, lead us to the truth apart from a most frank faci
in the light of the best scholarship, of all that has at least a *prima fa*
claim to be considered fact in the life of the historical Jesus. In
historical reconstruction the outer fact and its probabilities and
inner intuition and its probabilities must co-operate together.
the inner intuition with its probabilities, we repeat, is a very sha
thing to which to trust, especially in relation to a figure like Jes
unless we believe that He is Himself increasingly given to us in
inner life and in our best and sincerest relations to life as we n
know it.

No better illustration of this could be found than precisely t
question of apocalyptic. The external fact with which we are f
presented is that the Synoptic Gospels contain a very considera
quantity of apocalyptic material purporting to have come from
lips of Jesus. Our first reaction to this is probably one of puzzlem
and aversion. It does not fit on to our way of looking at thin
This drives us to make a closer, more critical examination of
apocalyptic material, in the light of the best knowledge availab
and from this it immediately becomes obvious, in view of the li
apocalypse in *Mark* 13, that there has been imported into the teach
of Jesus at least one lengthy apocalyptic passage which was
originally there. The question then is, how much else has b
imported? In answering this our tendency, in view of our ini

action of distaste, is to put as much as possible into the class of reported apocalyptic material; perhaps we shall endeavour to get it all into that class and so explain it all away. But now this inner distaste and the resultant endeavour receive a check in the external evidence. Can we really honestly suppose that in view of the quantity of apocalyptic material which is in the Gospels—often in closest circulation with the context—in view of the widespread currency of apocalyptic ideas and images in contemporary Jewish thought, in view of the manifest centring of much of our Lord's thought in the Kingdom and the Messiah, in view finally of the apocalyptic hopes of the early Church, can we really suppose that Jesus did not use apocalyptic images and ideas very often, and in relation to some centrally important things in His life and message? It is plain we cannot. However puzzling and distasteful, the conclusion that Jesus, in some sense yet undetermined, was an apocalyptist cannot be avoided.

But such a conclusion forces us at once to re-examine our inner attitude. Perhaps it is the deficiency and immaturity of our own spiritual outlook, its dependence too much on the spirit of the age, which makes apocalyptic even in Jesus so strange and repellent to us. We begin to see that that is so, being taught, we venture to believe, by the inner Christ under stimulus, so to say, from the Christ without. We begin to realize that there are permanent needs and perceptions of the spiritual life which very easily express themselves in apocalyptic forms and which in Jesus' day could hardly have expressed themselves in any other. Armed with this new valuation and understanding, we return to the Gospels and to the more definitely apocalyptic literature of that age, and comparing the two there begins to emerge a standard of judgment and discrimination. We begin to be able to discriminate between true and false apocalyptic, and this means we can begin to discriminate within the Gospel material itself. We grow more confident that such and such an apocalyptic utterance the Master could never have made just as it has been reported, or with just the meaning the context superficially demands. Yet none the less something quite definite in the way of apocalyptic remains. Thus we escape the palpable error of explaining away all the apocalyptic material in the Gospel, and the equally palpable error of taking it all at its face value and interpreting it as so many have done as the mere re-appearance within Jesus of the delusive hopes of His contemporaries. Thus we build up something approaching a true portrait of the Christ of history as we build up something approaching, even though it be still a long way off, a true portrait of Christ in ourselves. I sometimes think it is a most subtle and beautiful piece of Providence that the Gospel stories have been handed down to us in their present form, so scanty, so coloured by the mind of their authors, so open to various interpre-

tation; for thus we are forced back continually on to the interrogatio of our own inner life and are given room and opportunity to grow

With these lengthy, but I hope not unimportant, preliminar remarks, I turn to the apocalyptic of the time of Jesus, and ask firs what in general is the psychology of apocalyptic, what are th circumstances and states of mind out of which apocalyptic hopes an apocalyptic literature spring?

The answer to this question is in a general way perfectly clea The apocalyptic hope is the outcome of an intense realization contrariety between what is ardently believed and desired and wha actually is, between the world of values and the world of fact. Th historical circumstances in which Jewish apocalyptic arose and i which apocalyptic, or something like it, has broken out periodicall in the history of Christianity, should be sufficient to show this, apa altogether from the insight which modern research has given us int the psychology of conflict and phantasy. That men are prone t solve their conflicts and compensate their disappointments by brillia hopes and imaginary satisfactions, and that in proportion as the conflicts and disappointments are intense so they will find it th more easy to pass from expressions of hope as to what *may* happe to confident affirmations of belief as to what *will* happen—these a commonplaces which can probably be observed by every one of u at least occasionally in his own mind. During the war we had one two interesting examples of quasi-apocalyptic beliefs thrown up b the stress of those dreadful days: the passage of Russian hos through England, the angels at Mons, the return of Lord Kitchene these were all little apocalypses which in another age and a differe setting might have become national delusions on a grand scale. study of Jewish apocalyptic shows a *crescendo* of belief as the yea of bitter disappointment and galling inactivity mount up; prese and future, this evil age and the great age to come, become more an more violently contrasted, showing clearly that the ordina mechanism of phantasy-compensation which we can observe in oth spheres is at work here also.

Yet having said this, we have in reality said very little. The are writers who appear to think that so soon as it is shown th apocalyptic issues from conflict, and that the mechanism which ca and in apocalyptic admittedly does in some degree, lead to phantas is involved, no further consideration need be given. The sane ma can dismiss apocalyptic even as he dismisses the angels at Mon But this is to move much too fast. It is to assume that the sphere which a psychological mechanism is working does not make an difference to the value and validity of its products. Surely it mak a great difference. Conflict may be a necessary and inevitable ite in spiritual development; it may be that through it, and through alone, a new reach of spiritual perception and experience can

eved; it may be that the compensatory mechanism, the urgent
d to find some sort of solution satisfactory to the soul, is in this
ere of things a fundamental organ of truth, whereas in other
eres it may be entirely out of place, leading inevitably to falsehood
self-deception. Not that that means that in religion conflict and
e sort of compensatory solution in hope and belief will always be
eans of true perception and adjustment to life. They will not be.
erything depends on the general quality and trend of the religious
within which they occur. In a religious experience which is
lving orthogenetically, intense conflict and its solution in some
t of faith and hope, which pass as experience unfolds into assured
l fruitful vision, may be essential and indispensable; but in a
gious experience which has already taken a wrong turn and has
ome fundamentally twisted, such conflict and its solution may
ke matters worse, and bring about a merely morbid neurosis. In
er words, true and false apocalyptic can only be distinguished by
wing them as parts of a larger whole, as items within a given
igious and spiritual evolution.

That within the sphere of spiritual perceptions movement towards
re truth or more error takes place through conflict between facts
experienced and beliefs as previously held is, I think, fairly
vious. It is true to say that nearly every great discovery of
igious truth has had the same essential motive as apocalyptic; it
s come about through the soul's determination to find satisfaction
face of an unsatisfactory world. Religion is the soul's affirmation
itself against appearances. But it creates new problems in the
ry process of solving old ones; it is a principle of friction in life.
iction, however, is a principle of light. Apocalyptic might per-
ps be compared to the friction of cart-wheels on a road; its
uminating power, however, depends on what the wheels are made
and the kind of road it is on, that is to say, on its place in a wider
iritual evolution.

We illustrate this first by reference to Jewish apocalyptic. There
s been discussion at various times as to what the real origins of
wish apocalyptic are, what exactly is the religious process or
olution in which it occurs and by which it must be understood. A
eat deal has been made of Persian influence, but I think it has
en much exaggerated. At the most Zoroastrianism might have
ovided some of the external symbolisms in which Jewish
ocalyptic expressed itself, but it is more than likely that the latter
uld have fashioned essentially similar symbols for itself had
rsian ones not been ready to hand, the more so as there is some
ason to suppose that in the evolution of Zoroastrianism Semitic
fluence played a not inconsiderable part. There are few more hazy
d uncertain spheres of enquiry than questions concerning mutual
rrowings and influences between one religion or literature and

another. The question surely for us is whether we can trace a fair clear line of development within Jewish religion itself along the lin we have indicated, namely, the hammering out of new beliefs und the stress of new problems. If so, we may neglect possible Persi or Babylonian influences as quite secondary. It seems to me th we can, and the development has within it roughly two discernib strands, one deriving from the prophets and the other from t intense legalistic nationalism which developed after the Exil Whatsoever is of permanent truth and value in Jewish apocalypt evolved from the prophetic sources, whatsoever of transient falseho from the nationalistic legalism.

Considering first the elements of truth, everything goes back he to the profound ethical monotheism of the great prophets. In t prophets themselves the beginnings of apocalyptic can be clear seen in the thought of the Day of the Lord, when God acts, both judgment and in redemptive grace, towards His people and throu them to the whole world. And this remains the fundamental thi in apocalyptic throughout. Indeed I think that apocalyptic is phenomenon which has only spontaneously appeared in religio such as Judaism, Zoroastrianism, and Christianity, where God conceived primarily as Will, as active Holiness. Where God conceived more statically, the refuge of the soul is found n in apocalyptic, in the hope of a divine intervention and regenerati of life, but in mysticism or the hope of a present escape from Apocalyptic could not possibly appear in Buddhism or in religio thought dominated by Platonism, because, though both of these a possessed with a sense of the evil of this world, neither has any viv conception of God as moral energy. This by the way. We agre then, with E. F. Scott that the fundamental creative thing apocalyptic is the great primary belief that God is holy and inten to be dominant in His world. That fundamental thought abid throughout every manifestation of apocalyptic. Yet that does n carry us very far. We want an explanation not so much of t fundamental unity between the prophets and the later apocalyptis as of their obvious differences. Is there anything of true evoluti and development leading from one to the other? I think there is.

Schürer notes three chief lines along which the older escha logical hopes developed, partly in the time of the later prophets, b especially in the post-canonical period. Those older hopes were within the sphere of present circumstances and confined to the futu of the nation, but as the years passed they became (1) more and mo extended from the nation to the world; (2) more and more individu in their reference, coming at length to include a perso resurrection of the just man to glory, and sometimes of the unju man to perdition; (3) more and more transcendent and transfer to the sphere of the supernatural and the supermundane. Now

d to each of these three enlargements of the original hope it is difficult to see that a movement took place through conflict een the fundamental belief in one holy, active, supreme God of l and the observed facts of experience. Thus, first, the bitter riences of the Exile, the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, he Roman domination, made it increasingly more impossible to rd Israel in isolation from the rest of the world; faith in the e interest of God in Israel could only be maintained by positing active interest in all the nations of the world. Yet it was not a positing; out of the conflict there emerged a true vision of the ersal reference of God's rule, a vision which shone in its own to perceptive souls and could never afterwards be lost.

And, second, the same bitter national experiences, working in an ethical monotheism, inevitably enlarged the thought of 's interest not merely extensively, but also intensively. Some anation of the contrariety between Israel's hopes and her actual iny had to be found, and it was found in part through a new erstanding of the part the individual must play in the working of the Divine purpose. But again it was found not so much as excogitated solution as a new immediate discernment in the midst he stress of contradiction. Elect souls now saw quite clearly that l searches and judges the individual. Yet such an individualiza- of religion had within it the seeds of further conflict, and there- of still further discovery. It is within this period of Jewish ory, and most clearly of all in relation to apocalyptic hopes, that ef in a personal resurrection developed. The belief in a resurrec- to future judgment or reward may have all sorts of unworthy ives introduced into it. That there were such in the period of ish apocalyptic we shall see, but in itself it is a proper and inevit- unfolding of ethical monotheism so soon as this is seen to have ndividual reference. You cannot become aware of God's interest he moral issues of the individual life without becoming in time aware that such a Divine interest demands more than this life its working out. The intense problem which the facts of this life te for the man who believes that God deals with men as viduals and not in the mass, is, of course, vividly shown in the *k of Job,* as also the suggestion of the solution of the problem in thought of a judgment and vindication after death. Some sort, necessarily a crude sort, of belief in a resurrection to judgment reward is essential to any preservation, in face of the actual facts fe, of a belief in the reality of God's demands on the individual and conscience. Yet again the belief does not arise in the truly ceptive soul as the mere conclusion to an argument. It arises as minous perception at a certain point in the development of the itual life, so soon, in fact, as the latter becomes distinctly and sciously individual and personal in its relation to God.

Then, third, as religious experience develops, it of necessit becomes more and more aware, not only that God's Kingdom is a a matter of fact not fully realized in this life, but also that as a matte of necessity it never can be, inasmuch as it is God's Kingdom infinite, eternal, and this world is its essential meaning and purpos is merely transient and preparatory. This perception, again, arise out of conflict, out of the discovery, often painful and slow, that ther is a certain essential stubbornness and enmity between this world an the fullest life in God. This is one of the most easily misleadin and corruptible elements in apocalyptic, but I feel sure it is ther and that it is in some form or other a true development of spiritua experience. The evidence for its presence in Jewish apocalyptic w may give by quoting some sentences from Schürer:

> In the later view the present and future become more and mor pure contrasts. The future age is in all respects the entire contra to the present course of the world. It is purely transcendental; a the benefits come down from above, from heaven, where they ha existed from all eternity . . . The individual interest came to b no longer satisfied with a resurrection for the purpose of participatio in the Messianic Kingdom. This was no longer regarded as th ultimate and supreme felicity, but a higher, an eternal, a heaven happiness expected afterwards, even an absolutely glorious state i heaven.

I venture to suggest that there is in this intensification of the contra between this age and the age to come; in this growing sense that ther is a radical contrariety between what this world can offer even at it best and what God purposes for man, that it has not the natura resources within itself to become the Kingdom but needs transcendental redemption from above; in this optimism rooted i pessimism—that there is somewhere in all this a true development o the spiritual life.

Yet, as has been said, all these truths, if they be truths, were i Jewish apocalyptic deeply infected with error, and the error spran from the fact that the development of Jewish piety was more an more impeded and corrupted by the intense nationalistic legalism o the post-exilic period. Because of this legalistic nationalism th conflicts between facts and ideals lead not only to glimpses of high truths, but also to phantasies which occasionally bear all the mark of morbid neurosis, such as, for example, the pictures of the la woes—phantasies so prolific and confused that it is difficult to mak any generalization as to what was universally believed about th Messiah and the Kingdom. Concerning details you were free t believe almost what you liked according to the quality of your ow egotism. But, speaking generally, the victory of God in the wor tended to be identified with the domination of Israel over all heathe peoples; the latter were for the most part to be destroyed and s God's elect avenged. Again and in a similar way, the thought individual responsibility, of resurrection and judgment, was deep

corrupted with the inevitable egotism of legalism. Much of Jewish apocalyptic hope sprang from the demand for adequate rewards for keeping the law. It is a belief in resurrection and judgment not for the adequate reason that without such belief we cannot make sense of what is already given of God in the moral and religious experience, but for the bad reason that we want to be indemnified for what is not given in it, for all its effort and privation. Finally, in Jewish apocalyptic the sense of the inadequacy of this world as a place where the Kingdom could ever be realized, the postponement of the full realization of it to a period beyond the millennium, both sprang from and contributed to a failure to realize the gracious presence and purpose of God in this present life at all. It is remarkable and significant that Jewish apocalyptic never lost entirely its conviction that this world of created things could and would somehow be transfigured and redeemed, if only as preliminary to something bigger and grander still. In this, as I have said, it remained distinct from the Greek or the Buddhist outlook, which sees in created things something radically and irredeemably evil. None the less there is much in the temper of later Jewish apocalyptic which is religiously and practically, if not theoretically, akin to this other outlook. The present age is sunk in evil, under the dominion of satanic powers; God is remote, unresponsive, no longer the really active and present holiness and grace of earlier prophecy. Here again the corruption has much to do with the canker of legalism. The elaborate ceremonialism, the finicky casuistry, inevitably blunted the moral sense and confused the conscience, and the living and intimate sense of God as inevitably tended to disappear.

So much for Jewish apocalyptic. We now turn to the Gospels. We have already said that it is impossible to suppose that Jesus did not use apocalyptic thoughts and forms in relation to some of the deepest and most central things in His life. The apocalyptic element must not be watered down or explained away. If we approach the matter along the lines we have just followed we shall not feel any need to explain it away. We are to try to see it as part of a developing spiritual experience and perception. The value of this line of approach is that it saves us from the shallowness of supposing, as is sometimes supposed, that Christ's use of apocalyptic was merely pictorial, a using of images which were current at the time and which he had to adopt, rather reluctantly perhaps, in order to be understood at all. Thus I have heard it suggested that in so far as Jesus used or accepted the use of the term Messiah in relation to Himself it was merely as a condescension to the categories of the time. He was not averse to receiving the highest honour men had to give and that was the highest they had. That is much too artificial. There is something far more spontaneous than that in Jesus' use of all such phraseology. Messiah was doubtless a symbol—what religious

conception is not?—but it was not an extrinsic symbol, an item in a convenient and popular code; it was so deeply charged and closely articulated with the spiritual realities which gave it meaning that it would have seemed to Jesus a plain statement of obvious fact to say *I am Messiah*. We do not understand these things by taking them with stark literality, but equally we do not understand them by treating them as mere condescensions to man's weak pictorial mind.

I do not propose to review the apocalyptic material in the Gospels. I wish merely to suggest that the line of thought we have followed gives us some guidance in discriminating that material. It was, of course, just precisely in respect of their legalistic nationalism that Jesus was most critical of His contemporaries, and therefore we are entitled to suspect at once any details in reported apocalyptic utterances of Jesus which seem to reveal the influence of that legalistic nationalism along the lines we have indicated. Such phrases as "sitting on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel", "casting into outer darkness or the furnace of fire, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth", "depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and all his angels", seem to me to be instantly suspect, especially in view of the quite certain importation of extraneous matter in *Mark* 13. On the other hand, if we have correctly discerned true spiritual impulses and perceptions in Jewish apocalyptic these we may expect to find uncorrupted and deepened in Jesus; indeed, as I suggested at the beginning, it is the spirit and outlook of Jesus which has taught us to discern them. And this we do find. The coming of the Kingdom is absolutely central in Jesus' outlook as it was in the mind of His contemporaries. There is in His teaching concerning it the same thought of God's rule concerning itself with the whole world, but that rule is to be achieved, not by excluding but by including the Gentile in its beneficent purpose. There is the same thought of the individual's deep relation and responsibility to God, the same solemn thought of judgment and resurrection, yes, even to a reward, to a part in the great consummation when it should come; but the whole thing now is lifted out of legalistic egotism and related to that deep inward searching ethic of love which is so typical of Jesus. Finally, there is the same perception of the transcendence of the heavenly Kingdom, that in its full manifestation it will possess a glory and a reality far exceeding the mere sum of its stages, and will depend not so much on human effort and evolution as on the intervention of the Divine finger of power; yet all this is without the depreciation of this life, the banishment of God's near presence from it, the belief that it is all sunk in satanic powers, which is so typical of later Judaism. Not a bird falleth without the Father knowing. The kingdom is now and within; yet it is also future and without, transcendent, from above.

I think it is in respect of this last point that Jesus is most original. venture at least to wonder whether there may not be here n evolution of Jesus' thought under stress of conflict and contra- ction: thus he would conform to the general psychological rinciple that lies behind apocalyptic vision and imagery. I think iat Jesus began His ministry not without hope that the Jewish eople would respond and that the Kingdom would be immediately id manifestly inaugurated. His own unique and intimate sense of od's nearness, God's actual presence in the world, made it natural id inevitable that He should hope and believe this. But as the hope as more and more disappointed, as belief and fact fell farther and rther apart, He was impelled to new adjustments, deeper under- tandings of God's purpose and His own part in them. And here ame His profoundest and most original contribution to the thought f the Kingdom and the Messiah, namely, the incorporation into it f the Cross. He came to see that His own Passion and Death were idispensable to the consummation of the Kingdom. But how xactly? I am inclined to doubt whether Jesus saw how it would ork out. Thus to accept the way of rejection and defeat was along ne line of His deepest intuitions of God, it was indubitably what was equired of Him in the way of that loyal surrender without which in ny shape or form the Kingdom could never come. But in what nape or form it would supervene upon His Cross I repeat I do not ink He clearly saw. The Cross was the condition of its coming, ne condition to be fulfilled within the actual historical framework f this world, yet it was a plunge into mystery. For so far as the istorical conditions of this world were concerned the Cross seemed o register the defeat of God's Kingdom; yet somehow it was the ondition of its victory. Of what sort then was that kingdom which y its defeat here could yet be assured of its victory somewhere and omewhen? I suggest that out of the stress and contradiction of this ystery and contradiction thus focused in the Cross there came to ne Master an intenser and perhaps more truly apocalyptic vision an any he had experienced before. He saw the essential victory hich lay beyond the Cross and which depended on the Cross, yet le saw also that in a sense it was not continuous with anything that ould be observed in the actual forces which were governing the ves of men. There was a gap. The victory of God could not be rought out from beneath, from within the world at all, though what en did, and above all what the Son of Man did, was of the highest nportance and significance. It was something which the mystery f the defeat of the Cross showed clearly to transcend historical onditions or merely historical evolution. It could come only by the nger of God.

And yet again I do not imagine Jesus was ever in the least danger f driving the contrast between the present age and the age to come

so deep that the present age became merely an evil hindrance, a so of atheistic patch in the universe, a barrier and a veil between th soul and God. There is not the least trace of acosmic mysticism i Jesus. His is the true apocalyptic which holds together the though of God's Kingdom as a present possession in this life and the though of it as something transcending, alike in its glory and in th conditions of its coming, anything that this present life contains. suggest that this second thought came most vividly to possess Hi mind when facing the Cross, though without negating the first. Thi would explain the words which imply the imminence of His secon coming. Jesus' deep vision and certainty of God's victory in spit of, nay somehow through, His Cross, and yet the impossibility o relating that victory to anything that might happen from the man ward side, comes to expression naturally and spontaneously in th picture of the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power an coming on the clouds of heaven, not in some remote future—tha would cast a suggestion of dubiety over what was at the moment luminous certainty—but now, at once, so clear and intense is Jesus apocalyptic vision under the stress of His present situation. I thin we may add "so true" also. Thus we reach from a different ang substantially the same conclusion as that put forward by von Hüg in one of his letters, in his usual heavy style:

> The idea of a speedy second coming expresses a deep and abidin right orientation of first hand and specific spirituality, which, qui clearly, tends in proportion to its depth and purity to conceive a *sub specie aeternitatis,* and inasmuch as time is still considered apprehend such time as at hand and instantaneous. If our Lord d not know the date of His second coming (and this ignorance He tel us was with Him) then religious genius that He was, He was bou to conceive it as proximate and swift as lightning.

In other words the certainty of the final consummation is conveye through the symbol of its immediacy.

What is the relation of all this to our modern thoug and experience? Speaking for myself, I find it very difficult at tim to maintain anything like a quiet mind and an unperturbed faith face of the actual facts of history and of our present world except b a thought which seems to me to have the essence of apocalyptic in i It is one of the weaknesses of present-day Christianity to think the Kingdom too exclusively in terms of this world; the result is th when things on this earth seem to stand still or to move very slow faith staggers. We have to consider whether, while this world God's world and He can be found in it, none the less the part which is designed to play in the working out of God's purposes and the ed cation of men's spirits is not precisely that it is a place where we wo for ideas and ideals which cannot be fully realized here at all. An following on from that, it seems to me that faith is not properly bas until it has settled with itself that in the end the consummation w

ome about not so much through our striving as through the will nd activity of God. It is possible to have what Robertson Nicoll alled an irreligious solicitude for God. It is possible to think of im too much as One whose concerns we have to look after, and not nough of Him as One who is looking after our concerns, and some- ning far larger than ours, as at present realized, can possibly nclude. This again, does not mean that our loyalty and ork do not count; they do; they are even indispensable, ut they are not in the least adequate in themselves and were ever meant to be; wherefore their apparent continuous defeat not the irremediable tragedy one is sometimes tempted to onsider it. It may appear that this is to say nothing more han that we must have faith in God; but it makes all the difference, t seems to me, whether you repeat it as a mere pietisic formula or whether you are driven to it under the pressure and conflict of facts, o that it becomes in some sort a true apocalyptic vision.

But much more important than these personal vagaries of mine s what we can discern of the general trend of recent thought. First, we have been confronted in our own day with a striking out- burst of apocalyptic thought in religion and theology in the Barthian novement on the continent. This is apocalyptic in its origin, that s to say, it is directly related to the defeat and disillusionment of the war. It is apocalyptic in its content, that is to say, it is in the main a remendous affirmation of God as acting from above in revelation and n the redemption of man and not from beneath in the unfolding processes of nature and history. It is a return to a Hebraic onception of God as active revealing purpose, the kind of conception ut of which I said apocalyptic can only spring; and it implies a riticism of the too easy identification which theologians have made f the God of revelation with the more static Platonist conception of God. Greek philosophy, in other words, not only sent theology stray but also corrupted the springs of the religious life.

Now whatever we may think of the Barthian movement, it is idle o dismiss it, as some do, as merely a morbid out-cropping of a sort f post-war neurosis in Germany. That it is apocalyptic in its sychological origin may be admitted, but, if this paper has any ruth in it at all, that does not mean it has not real vision and insight ithin it.

Secondly, over against this increasing apocalyptic emphasis, on he one hand, there stands, on the other, the phenomenon of what nay be called the new naturalism, best represented in a popular way n this country by people like Julian Huxley and Middleton Murry. Here we have a deliberate and conscious effort to preserve the values f religion along with a complete refusal to believe that there is any urpose or will, so to say, outside the process itself, in which as

human beings we find ourselves involved. It is religion without revelation. It is the exact opposite of the Barthian position.

Truth seldom lies in either one or the other of exact opposities but the opposites are useful in order to indicate where the supreme issues lie for any generation. How are we to meet the naturalistic temper of this age, so much more subtle than the mechanistic naturalism of last century? Well, I think the value of our new apocalyptists is in this regard more in the sphere of religion than in theoretic apologetics. Indeed, they—very foolishly as it seems to me—scorn apologetics altogether. But religiously they are right, in that they affirm that the real weakness of present-day religion, and therefore of its witness to mankind, is its loss of the sense of the finger of God thrust down into human life. We need to recover something of the vision which enabled Jesus to go to the Cross, the vision of the Son of Man riding on the clouds of heaven in power. But in the sphere of thought I think the new apocalyptists are useless and even dangerous. It is useless to meet the modern mind merely with a bare affirmation of transcendent deity. There is a call for a new treatment of the everlasting problem of transcendence and immanence, relating it, on the one hand, to modern knowledge, and on the other, to the fundamental issues of the religious consciousness. But in such a treatment everything will depend on whether we start from a Platonic or a Hebraic conception of God. One of the permanent elements in apocalyptic is its insistence that we start from a Hebraic.

H. H. Farmer.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE.

The International Council will, we fear, make it impossible for many to attend the Congregational Theological Conference to be held in Oxford from 14th July to 17th July. The subject is "The Divinity of Christ", and papers will be read as follows:

"The Problem Stated". Rev. B. C. Plowright.
"The Teaching of Jesus about himself". Dr. C. J. Cadoux.
"Christ, the Author of Salvation". Rev. K. L. Parry.
"Life in Christ."
"Communion through Christ". Rev. Bertram Smith.
"Communion with Christ". Dr. R. F. Horton.
"Christ Worshipped". Rev. J. S. Whale.
"Christ of the Sacraments". Dr. C. H. Dodd.
"A Summing up". Dr. W. B. Selbie.

Particulars may be obtained from the Rev. N. A. Turner-Smith, Ramsgate. It is not proposed to print the papers as a supplement to the *Congregational Quarterly* this year.

EMBER DAYS.

ALONG the course of my ministerial life I have used diaries of divers sorts. When the Book Room of the Memorial Hall issued a diary, I, in the loyalty of youth, bought it. When now I behold the little books in my mind's eye, the recurrence of a Scout's diary, with the view of youth on its beguiling pages, surprises me. Yet more so does an M.D.'s diary, used by me who am not a D.D. or even a B.D.! The day when I committed them one and all to the flames was an "Ember Day" to me.

Diverse as were my diaries, they had their common-measure. They were, without exception, *ecclesiastical*. *Old Moore* and *Whitaker* are not more mindful of the Christian year. And this brings us to the cardinal fact. My set of diaries all notified Ember Days and Ember Weeks.

Now it was long before I knew the phrase-calendar of the Christian year. You see Scotland broke loose from the frame-work of the old religion. New Year's Day we knew and Martinmas—this latter, not as a holy season, but as a very secular day. Where England had its Festivals, Scotland had its Fasts. Nobody in my boyhood in our Strath talked of Easter holidays. Just about then the parish schools had a day's play, but that was because the Kirk kept Fast day preparatory to the yearly or half-yearly Sacrament Sabbath.

But to return to Ember Days and Weeks. *Who was Ember?* The Evangelists I knew, also Saints Peter and Paul, but "Who was Ember?", and "What are Ember Days and Weeks?", I asked. What was to be done in the face of the insistent diaries? A dictionary proved helpful. I stopped asking who Ember was, for the dictionary de-personalized Ember. He was no eponymous hero, though decapitated. If the genealogy of Ember had become legendary, the philology remained a problem, for doctors differed. Some said that Ember was native Saxon and came over before the Conqueror; others said he was classical—being a shortened form of Quatember; a late Latin word beheaded long long ago. This is certain, at any rate, that Ember days date from an early period in Latin Christianity, and I can understand that on their introduction into Saxon Christianity by Augustine of Canterbury—which is fact—and christened in Latin, as many things were, *Ember* became short for *Quatember*, itself an abbreviation of the full-dress title *"jejunia quatuor temporum"*. Young theologues in resident Divinity Halls contract College to Coll., and use a script of their own for important ceremonies in the curriculum. So I imagine a monk, no longer a novice, came to cut short *Quatember*, and would not show thereby that familiarity had bred contempt for the sacred season and its function.

Anyhow it pleases me to think that the Saxon Christians thought of the rolling year of Providence and grace in such guise of native speech as high churchmen of catholic proclivities could immerse in the lordly tongue of Rome and dedicate to churchly use. The title may be dog Latin, but it may be a relic of the mother-tongue when Caedmon found his voice uplifted to the Maker's praise and Hilda was Abbess of Whitby and Bede was doing his version of St. John's Gospel in his school at Jarrow.

Having paid heed to the pedigree of Ember there remains the enquiry *"What were Ember Days for?"*. Must they not have a purpose, concern a religious practice? Of what use are they? Who uses them? Does anyone? Are they good for nothing? Well! (*a*) The Orthodox Church knows nothing of them; (*b*) Catholics—Roman and Anglican—give them a fourfold place in their annual computation of the march of time. Hence the loyalty of *Old Moore* and *Whitaker* and the butcher and the baker and the candle-stick maker, who, in gratitude for past favours and in hope of continuance of the same (and more) present their customers with an illustrated New Year Almanac; (*c*) we, "the step-children of the Reformation", as Troeltsch calls us, do not come into the picture.

Catholicism hallowed these days of the four seasons in its quest for the Holy Grail—not the cup, but the spirit in which Jesus drank the cup. It linked them with the dedicated life—when youth vowed its vows.

In this respect the Roman ritual of observance is clearer and surer than Anglican practice. I have gathered but little from my searching into the *Prayer Book plus Hymns Ancient and Modern.* The two alternative collects are commonplace. The four hymns are neither ancient nor modern. Compared with commercial calendars the *Prayer Book* gives a poor press and little space to Ember Days and Weeks.

Next I asked for an answer to the question *"Who keeps the Ember Fasts?"* in the Oxford official manual—in vain. At a loss I wrote to a clergyman of the Church of England, a tried and tested friend through long years. Here is the salient portion of his letter in reply:

> "You ask an interesting question about Ember Days. Wycli urges their observance, as a Quarterly Fast. A century ago they were devoted to the examination and preparation of Clergy for Holy Orders, and nowadays the Bishops spend them with their candidates 'in retreat'—having examined them earlier—and the Sunday following is, as a rule, the Day of Ordination. The rubric of the *Revised Prayer Book* describes them as 'Lesser Fast Days appointed to be kept: but the services provided are not enjoined but only permitted'. To the two prayers appointed for use in the collection of prayers following the Litany, the Revisers have added two lessons out of the *Acts,* an Epistle, and three alternative Gospels. Some of the Bishops have

published an order of service for the Days, but they are not well observed in Churches or by lay people. I once preached a sermon on them, when Bishop —— was going to ordain to the Ministry on the following Sunday and the three Ember Days which followed. I went into the Church to give short instructions to the men at their evening and morning services."

There ends my friend's letter. His reply is plain, clear, and ndid. It reflects episcopal estimate, clerical activity, and laic lack interest in Ember Days. Finally I came upon two tit-bits on Ember ays. The first in Strachey's *Eminent Victorians*:

> "W. G. Ward, captivated by the glittering eye of Newman, swallowed whole the supernatural conception of the universe which Newman had evolved, accepted its fundamental premise, and began at once to deduce from it whatsoever there might be to be deduced. . . . (In his deductive logic) he explained mathematically the importance of Ember Days, adding, who can tell the degree of blessing lost to us in this land by neglecting, as we alone of Christian Churches so neglect, these holidays? Every day his arguments became more and more extreme, more vigorously exact, and more distressing to his master."

So far Strachey. When his successor writes on Eminent eorgians what controversialist Anglo-Catholic, in the dispute on the evised Prayer Book, will be found fervent in faith on the nportance of Ember Days, as was W. G. Ward when Oriel College, xford, was a fellowship of burning hearts?

My other tit-bit I picked up in Dean Burgon's *Twelve Good Men*. he Dean's twelve are some of the minor prophets of the Oxford ovement. One was C. P. Eden, "the earnest parish priest". He reached a sermon in York Minster on the Ember Prayers in the rayer Book. He had the luck to have a Sussex magistrate for a earer. This J.P. offered to defray the expense if the preacher would onsent to publish the sermon. The text was from *Jeremiah*: "I will ive you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with nowledge and understanding". That is the solitary express eference in Burgon's *Twelve Good Men* to these so vaunted and so dvertised Days.

Our mother-tongue has use for the word *Ember* in a quite on-ecclesiastical and uncalendared connexion. Our forefathers had eir household words for keeping the home fires burning. They alled the red-hot ashes of charcoal and peat-fires, embers. These lowed on their hearths; smouldered; and the ashes crumbled into ust. The rude forefathers of the hamlet even moralized embers, nd made out of them a picture of the passions of human nature. nyhow, their posterity did, and one of our poets declares, "E'en in ur ashes live their wonted fires", as he cons his *Elegy*. Thus, by ay of metaphor, the thing bequeathed an enormous extension of eaning and depth of intensity. Thus, unfrocked, and moralized, mber days realize themselves in our experience. Such seasons

crowd the records of literature, sacred and profane. Elijah afte Carmel had his Ember Day. In *Ecclesiastes* the fires of faith bur low. The Pilot of the Galilean lake had His Ember week. But need not poach on well-known preserves. I pass on to instances i contemporary life which, along with my diaries, have had place an power of suggestion on Ember Days.

Lord Salisbury, a great Anglican, read a Presbyterian minister' tract on baptism, and, as he laid it down said, "There is better stu in the Church of Scotland just now than in the Church of England' With that testimonial I follow the bias of patriotism and give tw pictures from the *Life* of Dr. Wallace Williamson, sometime ministe of St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh, and ex-Moderator of the Kirk c Scotland:

> "If there was little in Thornhill to explain Williamson, there is litt also in the record of his career in the University of Edinburgh. H was poor; he had to do tutoring to eke out his expenses; he had litt opportunity for social functions. But, all the time, unknown to hi fellows, he was living an intense life of the soul. There is a beautifu passage quoted from a diary which he kept from 1875 to 1880, writte in his second year as a Divinity student, which explains better tha anything else the man that he became. 'It is with a kind of tremo that I write this in the presence of my own soul and God. . . . am now about to begin the second winter of my Divinity course, an a vision of the infinite solemnity of my duties has flashed through me I will have to preach, if God spares me, the Gospel of Jesus to th men and women of this 19th century. God knows I am utterly unf for it . . . O Gracious Spirit, descend and make of me a temp worthy in its poor unworthiness wherein Thou mayest dwell.' Thorn hill does not explain him; the College and the Divinity Hall do no explain him; but *that* explains him. He had found the hid treasure.
>
> "The most stirring scene I ever saw in the Assembly was at meeting of the Commission of Assembly which was to decide whethe the Church would go to Parliament asking for an Act or not. speaker suggested that the leaders had secret motives for this polic of haste. When Williamson rose to reply, his eyes glowed like red hot embers. There was the gleam of a flame about him. The mos devoted of all the lovers of the Church, it was suggested that h betrayed the Church. He ended with a classical quotation: 'Marcu Scaurus was accused by Quintus Varius Hispanus that he excited th allies to take arms against the Republic. He, full of firmness defended himself. Marcus Scaurus denies it. There is no witnes Which do you believe, Romans?'. There was a dead silence. Th eyebrows went up; the glowing eyes flashed round the hall—and h sat down. Then there rose a hurricane of applause. The minorit only numbered 36; next year it was three or four. That scene, s moving, so dramatic, gave the final deathblow to the minority in th Church of Scotland."

I am content to have given the pictures. One is of the studen the other of the statesman, the first when young Williamson wa conscious only of God and his own soul, the second when he ha grown to be the spiritual leader of the Scottish people.

There follows an experience of Ember Days in the field of our n L.M.S. In Miss Christlieb's *An Uphill Road in India* she ys:

> "I bless Brierley ["J. B." of the *Christian World*] for the many helps he gives; his words have often been like sentinels, guarding the avenues along which resentment and discouragement and the fatal sense of futility of all effort assault the soul. *'Our Life'*, he says, *'is a continuous extraction from raw material of circumstance, of certain inner states. Shall we grumble at a world whose worst assaults are after all, opportunities for winning inner victories?'*.
>
> "These sentences have been my inspiration, this week, which has been a rather terrible one. I felt as if life had me by the hair, but helped by those words I had it by the throat."

gain:

> "Into the middle of utmost perplexity—when Dharmapalli was tottering, Andipur weakening, Bukhura unsafe, Ramedi apparently already fallen, *flashed the thought* 'Our faith is the victory', thank God, not our success (flashed also Brierley's words). Raw indeed is my material, but with it comes the chance of working at the artistry of life. Shall we grumble? Having been given these inner states the resolution to win *outward* ones seems to follow as a matter of course."

That might be entitled, "How to recover from Ember Days".

Principal Jacks has written about the lost radiancy of Christianity. piece from a leading article in the *Methodist Times* protests that

> "the Methodist churches have largely ceased to function as soul-saving institutions. The cry of the penitent is seldom heard within their walls. Conversions do not take place. The spiritual miracle has ceased to happen. What is worse, there is no expectation that it ever will happen. Sermons either are not made to convince men of sin, or so made, fail in their purpose. The plain truth is that Methodism has settled down into a church organization, and is no longer a great evangelistic movement compelling world-wide attention. The glow has gone."

The article goes on to appeal to Methodists to "fan the dying mbers into a living flame".

There will always be some who are not Fundamentalists at heart, ho may feel that some of the lustre has been bedimmed and may ıcline to echo the lament of Keats:

> There was an awful rainbow once in Heaven,
> We know her warp, her texture.

Does not this about the "lost radiancy" and the "faded glow" ring to the mind *Ember Days?* Dr. Jacks and the *Methodist Times* ave a consciousness of beclouded days besetting a whole community. he "Day" has broadened out to be an Age, an Epoch. Ember Veeks no longer return once a quarter as in the Anglican year. They mount to an enveloping and stagnant atmosphere.

There is here material for reflexion. Did not Jesus say "Never-ıeless when the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on

the earth?". Does not *Hebrews* say: "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering"? Is there not a church of the Laodiceans? And yet and yet, does not the cloud still guide the removings and encampings of the commonwealth of God? Are there not "pointers" when you follow the gleam and lift up your eyes on high and behold the signs of the times? Are there not *Gesta Christi* to-day as decisive as those chronicled in Loring Brace's book so named?

I have been critical of Ember Days. I hope I have been constructive by suggestion. Anyhow—

We cannot kindle when we will
The fire which in the heart resides!
The Spirit bloweth and is still—
In mystery our soul abides!
But tasks in hours of insight willed
Can be thro' hours of gloom fulfilled.

With aching hands and bleeding feet
We dig and reap, lay stone on stone:
We bear the burden and the heat
Of the long day and wish 'twere done!
Not till the hours of light return
All we have built do we discern.

JOHN R. LEGGE.

ROSSUM'S UNIVERSAL ROBOTS.

OUR modern age has witnessed the coming of writers not a few of whom, though their method and style may appear detached, have, with all the skill of physicians, diagnosed the condition of our day. They have, so to speak, taken the thought of the world upon themselves. Among such a company is Karel Capek. John Galsworthy says, "He is of the company that counts". Like many courageous and original thinkers he has revealed to us the significance of our dreams, reminded us, simply because we oft-times disregard the obvious, that from certain causes we can expect certain effects, and warned us of our unheeding ways. He is never satisfied merely to describe things as they are. He interprets. Possessed of a searching and discriminating mind, he does not hesitate to forecast the future. How far he is proved right or wrong in the days yet to be will depend upon the willingness or otherwise of our modern age to repent of its sins, cure its blindness, and really to care about posterity. Like those who, imagining that an easy optimism is reality, ruthlessly dismiss Hardy as a miserable, unrelieved pessimist; or others who, wilfully resenting the trenchant criticisms of Mr. Bernard Shaw, imagine him an irresponsible buffoon; or even like those who label Mr. Edgar Wallace's productions "tripe" and yet still unblushingly read him; we are in danger—like all unwitting critics—of forgetting that every writer, in his own way, estimates his age. A criticism of a writer is often a criticism of that which we have not the wit to see. If Hardy pricks the bubble of those who fondly demand that life's return shall be always sweet; if Shaw strips ideas of unnecessary shibboleths and points to a still avoided concern of life—the need of economic security; if Wallace tells men that he knows they, with all their pretence, are low-brows; we may take it for granted that we are in need of such a truth. And Capek is not remiss in this respect. He has a truth for our modern age. What is that truth? First, let us seek some standard of judgment.

It must be acknowledged that it becomes increasingly difficult to judge our age. New problems arrive with every new day, and new arguments are constantly being propounded for one position or another. In consequence, judgment is almost incurably partial. Only the genius, be he poet, philosopher, or playwright, can rise above the confines of a limited world and achieve a philosophy at once comprehensive and continuous. Yet every man ought to attempt an appraisement of his age. Without such an attempt it is impossible rightly to understand the intention of a writer who, from whatever motive, considers it his business to be critical or satirical, popular or practical. It is not so much that writers dress up their ideas in parti-coloured clothes or even in no clothes at all wherein our difficulty lies, nor yet in the form, be it novel, play, poem, or yarn, through which

they desire to express their views. Our difficulty lies in striving t understand our age. Karel Capek, who, though young, has earne an enviable reputation on the Continent and in America, helps us t that end. *R.U.R.* represents an endeavour to get our age to unde stand itself and the way in which it is tending. It may be a parti understanding, but, as we hope to discover in the play, a necessar one.

What kind of an age, then, is ours? If we had to answer Hard we should say it is an age that blinks at facts; if Shaw, that it refuse to go to root principles and is carelessly content to bungle throug life, custom and tradition being sufficient for its purpose; if Wallace that it is a happy-go-lucky age desiring to be entertained and seekin to shun reality in "shockers" and still more "shockers". But ou answer to Karel Capek must be along other lines. It is no othe than this. Our age, glorying in the power of machines, wittingly o unwittingly, increases their necessity. Such a necessity will mean though to this fact we are almost blind, that machines will cease t be our servants and will become our masters. Men may mak machines but in the end machines will, inevitably, break men Meanwhile, men are becoming like unto the machines they make Such is the implication of this weird problem-play, *R.U.R.*

Harry Domain, General Manager for Rossum's Universa Robots; Fabry, the Chief Engineer; Dr. Gall, Head of the Physio logical Department; Jacob Berman, the Managing Director Dr. Helman, Psychologist in Chief; Alquist, Clerk of the Works all agree that our modern world wants not men but machines, no human agency but Robots. They are sure of it, and, apparently not without sufficient reason, for orders are being received int Rossum's works for thousands and still more thousands of Robots Robots to cheapen output, Robots for cheap labour, Robots for th Tropics, Robots for armies, Robots required as clerks, servants salesmen. The whole world cries out for machines—"Give u Robots". The human agents managing the Rossum factory hav no doubt about their age. It would go on demanding machines And their age is ours. It is an age which, from all avenues of life unceasingly cries, "We want more Robots". The air mechanic an the pilot, the ship's first engineer and his captain, the owners an directors of coal-mines, the army General and the private, the house wife and the servant, the ploughman and the farmer, the baker an the chef, the ironfounder and the fitter: from all who direct affair and from all who work for bread comes the cry, "We want mor machines". And increasingly numerous are the prophets who urg them on. In the thrill of expectancy they cry, "We want mor machines and better. We want machines that will knead and bak our bread, cars that will not need to be driven, steamers that need n propelling, mechanical ploughs that need no ploughmen. We wan

chines that will hew our coals, machines that will mould our iron, chines that will fell our trees. Give us Robots ".

It is quite beside the point to ask what will become of the human ment. We have not arrived at that point yet. Indeed, we don't derstand the value of the human being. The only thing we under- nd at the moment is cheap labour, cheapening of production, vants to do our work, a life of ease. And we create this position because we are unkind. We are not unkind. We are really siderate. Nay, more, we are idealists. We don't even object to Humanity League. Rather we, employer, employees, and all, prepared to support it financially. We still have virtues. We are without moral feeling. We have hearts. The human agents in arge of Rossum's Universal Robots rejoiced in such qualities. hen Miss Helena Glory, daughter of Professor William Glory, ited Rossum's factory with the ostensible purpose of looking after interests of the Robots, to save them from ill-treatment and to otect their future, the staff, instead of objecting, gave her ready nsent to say just what she cared to say to the Robots. And when e diplomatically protested that she might disturb them, cause ellion and what not, Domain, the manager, indulgently replied t such things would never happen. The Robots were machines. l sorts of people talked to them. It made no difference. They nembered everything—that was all. They were like men but less n men. It was no good offering sympathy or kindness to them, ggested Domain to Miss Glory: they could not respond. And, lly, they did not require it. Dr. Gall said it was not in his power give the Robots a soul. But Fabry was under no such delusion: was not in their interest", he said. But what did it matter when cost of production was coming down, the cost of material low, and ces falling still lower. Moreover, output was increasing. A loaf bread might now cost twopence, but in five years ——. Well, in e years, says Berman, the Robots sent to the Argentine to grow eat will mean

"that the prices of everything won't be a tenth of what they are now. Why, in five years, we'll be up to our ears in corn and everything else".

"Yes", replies Alquist, with some misgiving, "and the workers throughout the world will be unemployed".

"They will, Alquist. They will, Miss Glory", responds Domain with happy confidence. "But in ten years' time Rossum's Universal Robots will produce so much corn, so much cloth, so much everything that things will be practically without price. Everyone will take just as much as he wants. There'll be no poverty. Yes, there'll be unemployment. But then, there won't be any employment. Everything will be done by living machines. The Robots will clothe and feed us. The Robots will make bricks and build for us. The Robots will keep our accounts and sweep our stairs. There'll be no employment, but everybody will be free from worry and liberated from the

> degradation of labour. Everybody will live only to perfect himse
> . . . Nobody will get bread at the price of life and hatred. There
> be no artisans, no clerks, no hewers of coal and minders of oth
> men's machines".
>
> Alquist hesitates. "Domain, Domain. What you say sounds t
> much like paradise. Domain, there was something good in servi
> and something great in humility. Ah, Harry, there was some kind
> virtue in toil and weariness".

But Domain has thought his position out. "We cannot reckon wi
what is lost when we transform Adam's world", he answers.

And that was all that was recognized. Each human agent
Rossum's sees his position up to a point. Berman, the Managi
Director, says, in effect, "The world desires Robots. Good. I a
here to sell them. It matters nothing to me what they will be us
for, what problems they will create or what will be the outcome.
am here to sell and sell I will. All other concerns must fall to t
back of my mind. I am a business man. The business, this busine
my business must succeed. That is my concern. That is the end
my world. Let other things and other people—though I am n
without interest in them—look after themselves. I sell, and I wou
sell the world and its destiny if that were my job".

Dr. Gall, Head of the Physiological Department, like Berma
had one concern. It was an unrelated concern to Dr. Gall's min
He thought of it in isolation and forgot that nothing we create ca
in actual life, live in isolation. Dr. Gall cared only for experiment
He it was who created the Robots, and he made them more and mo
perfect. He made them like unto men but with a greater accura
than men. They must not be so liable to mistakes—not so uncertai
He made them and he had joy in his creations. He was engross
in his experiment. The experiment fascinated him to the exclusi
of everything else. How the Robots might be used was not h
problem. The quantity and type of demand for Robots was no affa
of his. He saw no problem other than that of his experiment. F
him, at the beginning, there was no problem of the human agent,
unemployment, of world catastrophe. He made. He created. Th
was all. What the created thing would mean in the world he nev
considered.

The same was true of the Chief Engineer and the Clerk of t
Works. They had a job to do and like honest workmen they we
prepared to do it well. It was their job. Fabry delighted himself
the perfect working of the factory, the fitting together of parts, t
linking up of departments, the stages which led to the production,
perfect condition, of the Robot. And Alquist had his own pleasu
in holding some authority over the present situation of Rossum
works and over all expected improvements and enlargements.
brief, they were all engrossed in their own job, their own priva
problem. They had not yet realized that no man liveth to himse

With the General Manager it was different. And with the Psychoist in Chief it was different again. Domain, a type prevalent in r own age—unfortunately all too prevalent—is a man who lives in o worlds without seeing the implications of either. As an lividual he is kindly, considerate and sympathetic; as a social being has ideals and dreams. And because of these things he is a likeable low. But the content of his social ideal is limited. He sees its ightness and it never occurs to him that there may be shadows. obots will mean paradise, he cries. And we must give him credit his sincerity. This is the type of man who, pulling down every ner ideal of life that confronts his own and in mad indignation mpling it under his feet, looks fondly at his own scheme and gains this darling fancy a peace of mind enabling him benevolently to hile upon the world, to tell people of the glorious days he is going make possible, to sigh for the present sorrow and smile for the omising future. Domain, in short, is Lord Birkenhead in nbryonic form. The fact is that Rossum's manager has not seen the her side of his scheme. The Robots will save drudgery, bring more isure, secure better clothes and cheaper food. A man will be free mply to live. So far so good. But Domain does not ask what the aking of machines and still more machines will mean in the long n. He refuses to recognize that machinery can become a menace well as a blessing. He dissociates himself from the evil nsequences of his trade, but with delight looks upon and lays claim the good effects. Domain is like many employers to-day who, as dividuals, are admirable fellows, and as business men have ideals ncerning their business, but who refuse to look at the consequences their activity. They see the good they are making possible but ink at the difficult problems and unfortunate evils they create.

Helman is a psychologist. A psychologist has the curse or the essing—it depends on the point of view—of seeing more than one pect of a problem. And though by effort of will a psychologist may ep out of his mind certain problems relating to his subject, he cceeds only for a time. He is a man who, of necessity, must see e consequences of every experiment and an ever-widening problem. is natural, therefore, that Helman should have doubts about the obots. He doesn't altogether like them. They are more perfect an men, yet they are less than men. And a student of the mind n never find satisfaction in a mind inferior to the mind of man.

Through these men Capek interprets our modern age. It is an e that does not realize the consequences of its actions. It is an age at is either too lazy or too afraid to think its way through to the lution of problems. It is an age that laughs at the prophet and es out for the strictly-defined patriot. The way we are going, iat is in store for us, the peril of limited conceptions, are situations at our modern world shirks. We are living in the hope of paradise

and we see no lions in the way. We wish all men well, and forg that wishes are not horses. It is an age wherein some men claim the are idealists and see not that their ideals are individualistic an partial. In short, it is a world that is not sufficiently concerned abou a world order, and though, in a way, it is still kind it misses the soci ideal. It is an age not big enough to meet its own problems, n clear-sighted enough to see where it is going. And where there is n vision, says Capek in effect, the people perish.

The play, which is enacted on a remote island between the yea 1950 and 1960, opens with a scene representing Domain's office. H is dictating letters to Sulla, a Robot, who talks as well as write Domain is pleased with the increasing demands for Robots. T letters of complaint he can be indifferent. He has not to seek orders they come. His work, however, is interrupted by the arrival Miss Helena Glory. Domain, obsessed with his job, with th bewildering increase of trade, knows intuitively, or presumes to know why Miss Glory has called. He would have deduced the reaso because of Helena Glory being the daughter of the distinguishe Professor, William Glory. But there were other grounds for such deduction. Everybody was interested in Robots. Everybody wante to see them, to see Rossum's works, to ask questions. Everybod wanted to talk to Rossum's manager about the wonder of all. Inevitably, therefore, Domain, who just avoids bein unnecessarily rude, cuts short Helena Glory's sentences while she still speaking, and proceeds to tell her just what she is going to sa Domain is so captivated by his job that he considers other people a thinking just such thoughts as he imagines they, of necessity, w think. But Miss Glory has really come on behalf of the Humani League. She has a keen sympathy for the Robots: she desires the to have a soul. Since, however, Domain desires to explain matte and Helena Glory desires information, the manager talks and th visitor listens. Domain, glad of such an opportunity tells, as thoug by rote, the story of the manufacture of the Robots. How that o Rossum, the great physiologist, in 1922,

> " betook himself to a distant land and attempted by chemical synthe to imitate living matter known as protoplasm, until he discovered substance which behaved like living matter. That was in the ye 1932. From the first attempt, which was to create a dog, he start on the manufacture of man. He made a bungling attempt manufacture everything as in the human body—exactly like man. took him ten years ".

Then young Rossum, a nephew of the old man, took the matter u He realized that if you cannot manufacture a man in less than t years the experiment is worthless. So he began to cut out t unnecessary things about man, such as feeling happy, having t capacity and desire to play the fiddle, and the desire to go for wall

ge simplified. On this matter the old man and the young one arrelled. Old Rossum experimented for the delight of experiment d that he might substitute Providence in the creation of an. Young Rossum simplified for commercial reasons. The oshot was that young Rossum shut up his uncle in a laboratory here he could experiment until he died. After all, the old man had ot the slightest conception of industrial matters. He was mad. elena Glory expresses doubt at such a position. But Domain armly supports young Rossum.

> "A petrol motor must not have tassels or ornaments, Miss Glory. And to manufacture artificial workers is the same thing as to manufacture motors. . . . What sort of a worker do you think is best from a practical point of view?"
>
> Helena: "The best? Perhaps the one who is most honest and hard working."
>
> "No", replies Domain, "the cheapest. The one whose needs are smallest. Young Rossum invented a worker with a minimum amount of requirements. . . . In fact, he rejected man and made the Robot. My dear Miss Glory, the Robots are not people. Mechanically they are more perfect than we are . . . but they have no soul."

The other members of Rossum's management, Berman, Alquist, all, Helman, Fabry, break in upon this conversation. They are s delighted as Domain to see Miss Glory, who, thinking they are obots, pities them. Domain disillusions her and she becomes mbarrassed. Introductions follow, and Helena Glory, swift to upport her cause, makes her appeal that the Robots be treated kindly nd be made happier.

> "Impossible, Miss Glory", says Fabry. "Nothing is more unlike a man than a Robot".
>
> Helena: "What do you make them for then?".
>
> Fabry: "For work, Miss Glory. One Robot can replace two and a half workmen. The human machine was terribly imperfect". "It was too expensive", put in the Business Manager.

Miss Glory is an innocent abroad, an innocent bewildered—an dealist among realists. Her idealism is limited to expecting Utopia y practising the gentle art of being kind and by recognizing the alue of the individual soul. Beyond this she does not go. The anagement of Rossum's include in their stark realism a mistaken Utopia, a Utopia which is only possible to those people who see one de and one side only, of every problem. Miss Glory brings with her nother type of Utopia, but still of a limited order. In the marriage f Domain and Miss Glory, which takes place with surprising uddenness, the realism of the one and the limited idealism of the ther are united. What will be the outcome? What can be the utcome of such a union? Let us see.

The plot, though effective, is slight. Capek allows five years to ass that the influence of Mrs. Domain on her husband and his riends might be illustrated. The end of the period is celebrated by

the men folk bestowing presents on Mrs. Domain. It is during thi process that Helena realizes that something is amiss. In searchin through her husband's pockets for some of the presents whic Domain has brought from his staff she comes across a pistol. Wha does it mean? Her husband evades the question and bids her loo out of the window towards the bay and see his present. She look and observes a vessel which afterwards she discovers is a war vesse bearing the name *Ultima*. She is apprehensive. The fact is, som thing has gone wrong, and Domain, though attempting to allay he fears, evades her questions. Dread comes upon her. She declare she is frightened. Though not actually saying it she infers tha there is something wrong about the manufacture of the Robots an the world's desire for them. Possibly it is because there are n children about. The fact is that for a whole week, as Domain tel her, there have been no letters or telegrams. She is alarmed. An when, finally, Domain, after answering the telephone, tells her h must go to the office at once to consult with his staff and refuses to b stayed, Helena makes up her mind. There is something wrong Thoroughly determined on a definite course of action she calls he servant Emma. Emma is devout and God-fearing—an ancient i theology. She is the type that, not seeing or unable to see th significance of certain actions, never hesitates, when things go wrong to put it all down to the judgment of God. In spite, however, of suc an easy abandonment of her problem, she has a philosophy which, without speculation, has the virtue that it works. For when Helen after receiving the papers which she ordered her servant to fetch begins to read of war in the Balkans, and in misery exclaims, " It always the same, always wars", Emma asks her what else she ca expect, " selling thousands and thousands of these heathens a soldiers". And when Helena, compromising with her idealism attempts to justify her husband by saying that " Mr. Domain can know what they are ordered for, can he? He cannot help what the use the Robots for", Emma brusquely replied, " He shouldn't mak them then". Emma is pious and makes her piety cover a multitud of problems that she never attempts to solve.

Helena, spurred by her fears, first through Alquist and then b means of Radius, a Robot, seeks a solution of her difficulty. Bot prove unsatisfactory. Still bewildered, she sends for Dr. Gall. H convinces her of the inevitability of the Robots. And Helena, wit her fears still unallayed, desperately determines, once and for all, put an end to the problem of the Robots and make possible a mo human life. Deliberately, though not without anxiety, she burns th paper which alone contains the secret of the manufacture the Robots. It was old Rossum's prescription. The men fol including Domain, enter the house immediately after Helena grave action. They are satisfied that now, having deliberated on th

nestion, they will be able effectively to deal with the Robot revolt nich they realize is at hand. They can see their way to an ever creasing success. They are happy about it. They light-heartedly form Helena of the Robot revolt throughout the world, and inconsequential fashion reveal their trump cards, laughing all the me at her fears. If the worst came to the worst they could all go on oard Helena's gift ship *Ultima* and, furthermore, they would go ith the secret of the manufacture of the Robots—old Rossum's anuscript. Helena, startled at such information, is overwhelmed ith horror at the deed she has just committed. Confession is not ng delayed. Domain, who until this moment has had such onfidence in himself and the future that he could, even in spite of ne Robot revolt, talk glibly of the future possibilities of Robot anufacture—how that future Robots would be national characters nstead of universal, and how, in consequence, by being egged on ney would hate each other—is now genuinely perturbed. One thing nly he had been waiting for—the arrival of the mail boat. Once that as to hand, all Rossum's staff must make a dash for the *Ultima*. Thus freedom would be gained. But a shock awaits him. Fabry, who has been down to meet the boat, brings serious news. The eople manning the boat are Robots. The worst has come. "Quick, o the *Ultima*", cries Domain desperately. It is no use, suggests Fabry, the Robots are in possession of the *Ultima* and by this time he house will be surrounded by Robots. They listen. The sound of whistles and sirens is heard. Domain understands. It is the Robots' ignal. The attack commences.

The end of the struggle is never in doubt. Human agency is lefeated: machines win. Though men created machines the creators re mastered by the created thing. This is the issue of Capek's hilosophy. And, difficult though it may be for our age to conceive is position or even to suppose it likely, Capek makes his play aturally suggest that creators can know defeat. But the defeat is nevitable not because of creators but in spite of them. It was their imited conception of what was good for the world that brought isaster. And, suggests Capek, no quality of invention or discovery an circumvent the destructibility of wilful limitation of truth.

All Rossum's staff, with the exception of Alquist, are killed by he Robots—killed by machines. Even Helena Glory, for all her indness, is not able to live. With her, partial and limited idealism ies, as it always will when faced with the menace of things created y those wilfully blind to the consequences of their concerns. The Robots—limited things created from limited ideas—give no quarter. Berman, who tries to buy them off, fails; in his eagerness he falls on he electrified barricade set up for defence against the Robots and ies instantly. The Robots, witnessing his death, close down the lectric works, mount the barricade, rush to the house, and kill ruth-

lessly. The greatest defender of all, Helman the psychologist struggling to keep back the power of machines (for let us remember a true psychologist will always defend human qualities) is stabbed in the back. Machines conquer. Strangely, however, as the play closes the Robots, yearningly seeking a solution of their sterile world—world from which the creators have now gone—turn to Alquist, the only human saved by the Robots and saved only because he was a worker by hand, appealing to him to create Robots or to give them the secret. He protests that he is helpless: he knows not the secret. The Robots must find a way for themselves to procreate life. And when, in desperation, Alquist declares that he will try to find the secret by taking two Robots, a man and a woman, to the dissecting room, he discovers that the Robots have gained a human quality. These two care for each other. Neither wants the other to die. There is the secret, says Alquist: "Go, Adam—go, Eve". In this union there would be another creation.

This ending is, we think, confusing. Possibly it is due to the difficulty that must inevitably arise when a writer attacks a machine age and at the same time suggests that human beings are becoming machines. Capek can hardly expect us to believe in the probability of machines becoming as humans in that they marry and replenish the earth. Rather, it would appear, in his epilogue he expresses the wish that men and women who have become as machines, lovers of mass production, mechanized in mind, steeled in spirit, will at last return to a regard for personality and crave a new satisfaction. This position, and the fact that Capek is himself a doctor who may have been professionally concerned about the decrease in the birth rate may account for this otherwise puzzling and rather ineffective epilogue. But the main theme is unmistakable and is pertinent to our modern life. Capek has an anxiety about what people undiscerningly call progress. When Helena felt nervous about the Robots she asked Alquist if he ever felt nervous.

> "Well ma'am, I'm an old man, you know. I'm not very fond of progress and these new-fangled ideas."
>
> Helena: "Like Emma?".
>
> Alquist: "Yes, like Emma. Has Emma got a prayer book . . and has it got prayers for various occasions? Against thunderstorms? Against illness?".
>
> Helena: "Against temptations, against floods ——".
>
> Alquist: "And not against progress?".
>
> " Would you like to pray?", Helena enquires.
>
> Alquist: "I do pray".
>
> Helena: " How?".
>
> Alquist: " Something like this: 'O Lord, I thank Thee for having wearied me. God enlighten Domain and all those who are astray, destroy their work, and aid mankind to return to their labour, preserve them from destruction; let them not suffer harm to soul or body; deliver us from the Robots and protect Helena, Amen.' "

Capek is in agreement not with the thinking of Alquist but with
s desire. For Alquist, though he prayed, was not sure whether he
lieved. He prays, he declares, because it is better than worrying.
e pleads with God to save the people and does not recognize that
od only works through men. He sees that mankind is being ruined.
e is sure mankind will be destroyed unless ——. That is as far as
gets. He cannot think constructively. He knows mankind needs
ving but he hardly knows how. Such a position, natural to our
odern age, is as futile as that wherein people see good things only
cause they close their eyes to the bad.

But what have we to do about this progress in machines? Samuel
utler wrote *Erewhon* for this among other reasons: to prick the
nceit of men who laughed at the very idea of machines ever taking
ie place of men. It was Butler who first suggested the repro-
uctivity of machines. And he interpreted his position not by
eferring to the new machinery coming out of the old and still due
o the creation of men, but to the increasing awareness of the machine
f its own qualities. "I would repeat", says Butler, "that I fear
one of the existing machines, what I fear is the extraordinary
apidity with which they are becoming something very different to
hat they are at present". For Butler was quite sure that men
ouldn't do without machines, that, indeed, they were more
ependent on machines than machines were dependent on men.
Iachines are already our masters. And because we have become
laves to the machine we cry out for more. We claim this as a
olution. But our thinking is all muddled. Thus Dean Inge points
ut truly that all the pleasure of creation, all joy in labour, all art
nd ingenuity are killed by excessive mechanization. Yet he goes on
o argue that, so far as England is concerned, the present standard of
fe can only be secured behind guns and rifles. Which means, if
iere is such a thing as progress, we must get more guns and better,
r, as he very naïvely puts it, "the only way to get rid of
is necessity is the lowering of wages—a universal high standard of
ving being impossible".

And while Dean Inge, like Oliver, asks for more, those who
rovide the supply paint their unshadowed Utopia. Mr. L. R.
mith, President of the A. O. Smith Corporation, in an article
ublished by *The Magazine of Business* (Chicago) confessed that he
ill employed a few men but that he is after a hundred per cent
ngineering achievement. This was on 8th May, 1929.

> "In 1904", said Mr. Smith, "my father, in a burst of enthusiasm, offered a bonus of a house and lot to the superintendent of assembly whose unit could produce twelve (automobile) frames in a single day. And now we are aiming at thousands! Sometimes I share the amazement of a visitor as we watch a completed frame leave the conveyor end, brushed and cleansed for the paint line every ten seconds of the production shift. New drives are being installed which will make

> the future production at the rate of one frame every six seconds. . . .
> There are 552 operations required on an ordinary frame as we build i
> Our production goal was 7,200 frames a day—or over four millio
> operations. Simplification, standardization, elimination, an
> condensation rang continuously in the minds of our engineers".

This firm set out to produce 7,200 frames with 180 men. One o the chief engineers declared it would be a mighty fine job to produc 8,000 frames per day with 120 men. "And mighty poo engineering", replied Mr. Smith. "Even now", he declared, "w are using more (men) than we should". And he accounts for the me by saying that having conquered all the big problems of engineerin they (the management) have little heart to tackle the smaller ones Only that situation stood in the way of having a factory where no me were required.

This state of affairs is heaven to business men like young Rossum Domain, and Mr. L. R. Smith. And they see not the hell of ma demoralized on account of lack of work or dehumanized by work tha makes him subservient to a machine. It is this hell of which Cape reminds us. Ruskin shrieked against the ugliness of industry an Morris pleaded for refinement, but neither saw what the enlightene modern man looks upon to-day. Now we understand, in som degree, that industry does not reach its stages haphazardly : it is th result of ideas and ideals. Domain, in the end, recognized that th Robot revolt came as the result of making too many Robots, but al the time he had justified himself by saying that he had no ulterio motive. Alquist might put the trouble down to godlessness and th desire for profits, but Domain protested that he had never worked fo dividends but always for the benefit of men. Helman finds th source of trouble in their neglect of lovely things. Berman stil thinks that money rules the world and that even revolutions can b brought to nought by hard cash. Dr. Gall confesses that the Robot have ceased to be machines. Alquist, still thinking hard, make another attempt at a solution : he blames science. It is in seekin for some solution that Capek introduces a question which may wel be the theme of the play. Women, it would seem, constitute tha force in the world that keeps alive the soul. The real reason for th revolt of the Robots is that Helena Glory persuades Dr. Gall to alte the Robots—to make them more human. Dr. Gall could not resis her appeal. Helena's reasons for persuading him were, first, o account of the voice of the people as expressed by Emma her servan and, second, because she was afraid of the hate of the Robots. An both positions lacked that element which alone could have save human beings—a world view. It is not to be wondered at, therefore that Capek refuses to save her when the revolt takes place. He idealism was not worth saving. It gave the Robots souls but n realization of the vital need to all humans—the creation of new an

etter personalities. And just as Helena Glory's attitude was nsufficient, and Domain's, and Fabry's, and Gall's, and Alquist's, o also was Berman's. They were not to blame for the revolt, he aid. It was the people who created the demand for Robots who ere to blame. "We rode along on the avalanche of demand. . . . hat's how it was, my lads."

Such were the views of those who fell in the struggle with nachines. And such people are in our modern age. Capek is eeking to save us. He has raised the curtain, the curtain which, nough highly coloured, has hidden the stage of life from our eyes. Machines are challenging men. Our age must make up its mind bout that struggle.

It remains to be said that *R.U.R.* may quite rightly be termed 'a gentle satire". It is, unfortunately, a satire that more than once oses in directness. Obviously, Capek has not been able to avoid ubsidiary problems in his play. Not that this is in itself an nexcusable offence. The trouble is that these problems sometimes bscure the issue. Undoubtedly the epilogue is strained, and in it ather extraordinary attempts have to be taken to bring the Robots o the human plane. Again, the analogy between the machine and he man often breaks down; though he makes ingenious attempts to eep the relation he becomes bewildering in so doing. At times the nachine—the Robot—is the mechanized man or mind, at other times e is a machine independent of men. In this, however, Capek does ucceed: he proves their inter-relationship, their inter-dependence, nd the consequences of a wrong valuation. Like Butler, to whom he s undoubtedly indebted, he says: worship machines and men will nevitably become slaves. Progress is something more than the naking of machines. Thus *R.U.R.* appears to say with significant neaning for our day what Gordon Bottomley said in his poem, " To ronfounders and Others".

You have brought d wn the firmament,
And yet no heaven is more near;
You shape huge deeds without event,
And half-made men believe and fear.

Your worship is your furnaces,
Which, like lost idols, lost obscenes,
Have molten bowels; your vision is
Machines for making more machines. . . .

The grass, forerunner of life, has gone;
But plants that spring in ruins and shards
Attend until your dream is done:
I have seen hemlock in your yards.

T. W. Bevan.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

No age has been so marked as ours by interest in the Jesus of the Gospels, and yet, within as without the churches, there is much confusion as to what He is and means. There are many who, although they give to Jesus the sincerest reverence, feel they do not know where to place Him. Their devotion to Jesus fails to lead them to a full faith in God, for they have not learnt to think of God and Christ together. Others there are who, finding it strangely easy to believe in God the Father, feel that the Church's assertion of our Lord's divinity is a needless addition to their faith in God. Each type of view is surely unsatisfactory. The first gives to Christ a worship which is idolatry, for Christ is not thought of as one with God the Father. The second makes those who hold it feel that they have lost contact with the Church's faith, and deprives them of the glad confidence that should be theirs in Christ's unique and final meaning.

The confusion which the existence of these two views reveals finds more frank expression now that the orthodoxy of the Creeds has lost its restraining power. But the confusion seems to me not new but old, and to arise from a false approach to the meaning of our Lord's person which dates from the time when Christianity was first associated with pagan thought.

It is natural that we should turn first to the Synoptic Gospels although we have only to remember the bewildering diversity of the accounts which men have given of the Synoptic Jesus to realize that we are all in the greatest danger of seeing in Him not what He was but what we would like to believe Him to have been. This at least we may surely claim : if it is impossible for the faithful student of the Gospels to see in Jesus the stiff figure of the old orthodoxy—a God remote from temptation and from human ignorance and need—it is equally impossible to see in Jesus merely the gracious brother of us all, content to be Himself forgotten if only God and man be loved. The older apologetic was indeed wrong in its emphasis upon the "claims" of Jesus. The phrase is an offensive one. It is egoists who make for themselves "claims". It was not His own claims, but God and God's Kingdom, which formed the burden of His preaching. He made the incredible believed. The awful, holy, God was the God of love, the Father caring for every man, and desiring every man's devotion. But this tremendous paradox became credible to His disciples, and can be credible to us, only because He belonged to His own proclamation of God. We cannot fathom the secret of His inner life, nor make of Him the hero of a psychological romance. He remains beyond our comprehension. Yet He need not be to us what Schweitzer called Him, a "stranger" and an "enigma". We can understand something of what He was through what He said and

d, and through the impression which He made on those with whom e lived. We know His utter trust in God, His perfect adequacy to very need, His patience with His disciples, His compassion and His ernness, the strange union in Him of characteristics which in other en would be self-contradictory. We know His moral majesty, how hen mocked and bleeding He could remember Peter's need; how, hen stretched in agony upon the awful cross, He could pray for ose that nailed Him there that they might be forgiven, for they knew ot what they did. His prime concern was not to reveal Himself but convey to men God's holy and forgiving love. In doing this, He evealed Himself, for what God is and man might be is known alone n Him.

And from the beginning God and Christ were identified in the xperience of the Church. We have no record of any time when faith n Christ meant merely trying to imitate the faith of Jesus. The only Christianity of which our records speak is a Christianity in which esus was part of the Christian Gospel, inseparable in experience from God Himself.

It was this unformulated faith which Paul expressed in the ategories of his age and place. In Christ the eternal became for Paul the present, for the eternal was not now for him the unknown. ts content was given to him in Christ. Life in Christ was life in God, and life in God was life in Christ. Christ for Paul was one livine, and yet in no sense a rival to God. Instead, it was through is faith in God the Son that Paul gained his certainty of the Father's ove. God for him was the God in whose divine life Christ shared, he God whose holy love Christ's earthly life and death revealed.

We have the same discovery in the Gospel which bears John's ame. The Jesus who shared our human weakness is the reflexion of God. His glory is the glory of the only-begotten of the Father. To know Him is to know God; to see Him is to see the Father.

So far we have been dealing with the interpretation of Christianity by men of Jewish stock. To the Jews God was the living God, a God personal and active, mindful of His people's needs, demanding from hem righteous lives. To these first believers Christ was not, to use Origen's unhappy phrase, "another God". In their experience and heir thought, God and Christ were inseparably joined. The grace of Christ was the grace of God, and to be in the Lord was to be in communion with God, the God whom Christ revealed. This faith worked out inevitably in love. The revelation of God in Christ was not a mere addition to what they already knew of God. In Christ hey learned to re-think their thought of God, so that by God they came to mean the God whose holy love had been revealed in Christ. And this faith carried with it the transformation of all values, so that hey sought to judge of every problem by the light which came from Christ's life and death.

How different is the presentation of Christianity in the pos apostolic writers. It would be unfair to blame them. To understan their position we need to think of converts, say in India, to-day. I our Protestant churches, our converts are encouraged to read the Ne Testament and to base on it their life. Yet how little of its deepe truths do they understand. Christianity is strange and new, and the have somehow to adapt it to their realized needs. Inevitably the find it primarily a teaching to be learnt and a law to be obeyed Christ takes for them the place of all the gods or demons they hav loved or feared. But they do not find in Him the image of th supreme God. They have, for the most part, two Gods: Christ, th God who has their active interest and love, and the supreme God, dim and distant Being with whom Christ is only imperfectl connected. In this way unchristian views of God survive side by sid with unmistakable devotion to Christ, the Christians' special God.

That is what we find in the Gentile Church, and to this ancien failure to Christianize the idea of God we owe, as it seems to me, muc of our modern confusion as to the meaning and significance of Jesus Instead of seeking first to know God in Christ, the early thinkers o the Church assumed that God was known, and sought to explain th mystery of Christ in terms of conceptions of God and man whic were incongruous with Christ's revelation of what God is and ma might be.

In the Eastern Church God remained the God of Gree philosophy, incomprehensible, nameless, without desire or feeling The Arian controversy was thus not an accident: it was the inevitabl result of trying to relate the person of Christ to a pagan idea of God The Church rejected Arianism, and asserted that Christ was of on substance with God; but that rejection was necessarily incomplete In the imagination of the Church Arianism conquered, for th Church continued to think of God as the meaningless Absolute o Greek philosophy, with which it was impossible to connect the actua human life of Jesus. It is not surprising that there followed thos dreary controversies on the relation of the divinity to the humanit in the incarnate person—controversies which destroyed the unity o the Church, and made great Christian lands the easy prey of Islam When at last the Christological dogma was complete, theology ha become a "sacred mystery". God had been declared triune, but H was not so much the God known and loved in Jesus Christ as th great Unknown of pagan thought: and Christ Himself had becom so remote a figure that the last of the so-called Œcumenical Counci (787 A.D.) had to legalize the veneration of the icons, for popular piet had already turned for the satisfaction it failed to find in Christ to th veneration of His image, or the image of the Virgin or the saints.

In the Western Church there was a better recollection of the actua life of Jesus. The dogmas formulated in connexion with Easter

ntroversies were, indeed, accepted, but they were accepted rather as cred and mysterious truths of the Church than as the foundation of ractical piety. Practical piety had for its chief concern the efficacy the Church to mediate salvation. The Church's treasure lay in the pererogatory works of its most saintly members and Christ's work as thus interpreted. In this way His manhood, obscured in the fficial theories of His person, came again into the remembrance of ne Church. And this remembrance of the actual human life of Jesus ade possible, in the end, the Reformation, which had for its chief eaning the rediscovery of God in Christ.

As we turn to Luther's Primary Works written in the year in hich his breach with Rome was made complete, we find in them no novation of doctrine, but an immense reduction, a concentration on he one article of saving faith in Christ. There was nothing new, nd yet all was new. No longer was Christ regarded as the greatest f a vast host of intermediaries between God and man. He filled for he Christian the whole horizon. He was the sole and sure revealer f the Father's heart.

The personal God known in the personal man Christ Jesus: that as Luther's great discovery. But that discovery was soon forgotten. nd Lutherans and Calvinists alike elaborated theologies as elaborate s those which Luther had once attacked. Once again there was the ndeavour to know God "apart from Christ", and the interpretation f Christ's work and person was superadded to a conception of God erived, not from Christ's revelation of the Father, but from the onclusions of the "natural reason".

Often we hear the complaint that the assured results of Christian heology are few. It is comforting at times to remember that vangelical theology is really very young. It is little more than a entury ago that Luther's grand intuition found its first adequate xpression in Schleiermacher's great book, *The Christian Faith*. In his book, which happily has now at last appeared in English, heology ceases to be a congeries of isolated dogmas and becomes the ving and progressive experience of the Christian consciousness of particular Church of a particular age. No longer is Christian faith ade to depend upon Christian evidences. It has an inner certainty erived from the growing consciousness of redemption itself derived n turn from the total impress of Christ upon the soul. The old halcedonian formulæ are rejected as incongruous in themselves, and s unrelated to Christian experience. Instead, the perfection of hrist and His true divinity are derived from the perfection of that edemption which has in Him its source.

In his reaction against the exclusive objectivity, alike of ortho- oxy and of rationalism, Schleiermacher ignored unduly the element f the given. Instead of beginning with the historic Christ, and nterpreting the Gospel records in the light of Christian experience,

he began with the corporate Christian experience, from which h deduced the archetypal Christ. He was surely right when he claime that God's grace can only be known as it is appropriated by faith but man's faith cannot be the measure of God's grace. Because h began with Christian experience, and not with the Christ of th Gospels as interpreted by Christian experience, he failed to portra aright that Christ of whom the Gospels speak, or adequately t Christianize his idea of God.

But if Schleiermacher thus failed in part to discover the Go revealed in Christ, he showed the way. He brought Christianity bac to Christ, and taught men to distinguish between the immedia utterances of Christian experience, and its theological expression. N doctrinal statements can be final, for they are inevitably expressed i categories which are transient and local. So he helped to lea Christian thought back from all lesser aims to the supreme task seeking to understand Christ's place and person, and thus to kno the God revealed in Him.

Schleiermacher's great book exposed the discrepancy which exis between the orthodox doctrine of Christ's person as the Son of Go incarnate and the orthodox doctrine of God as taught in the so-calle Athanasian Creed, with its strong emphasis on the unitary characte of the Godhead. How can an eternal aspect of Godhead becom incarnate? Of the speculative attempts to remove this discrepancy is impossible in one brief article to speak with any adequacy. Thes attempts fall into two classes and have their origin in the massiv theologies of Thomasius and Dorner. Thomasius, conceiving Chri as the Son of God incarnate, explained that incarnation as the sel emptying, the *kenosis* of the external Son. The incarnate So possessed on earth the *immanent* attributes of the divine, th attributes of love and holiness and power. And yet His life was live on human terms, for He had renounced the *relative* attributes omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. In this way, th identity of the pre-incarnate Word and the historic Christ was mai tained, and, at the same time, there was asserted the real humanity our Lord's incarnate life. This theory involves the recognition the manifoldness of the Godhead, an emphasis on the threefoldne of God's tri-unity.

Dorner, on the other hand, emphasizing, with Augustine and th so-called Athanasian Creed, the unity of the Godhead, sought interpret Christ's historic life by the gradual impartation of the divi Word to the increasingly responsive human soul of Jesus so that th incarnation reached its climax only at the resurrection.

Both of these theories mark an immense advance in that they brin into unity the doctrines of Christ's person and of the Godhead, an both theories seek to assert the true humanity of Christ's incarna life. If an age of speculation should again return, we should ha

uch to learn from each theory. But the age of speculation passed, ıd has not yet returned. Hegelianism, which had seemed at first e friend of Christianity, proved its foe, and led to the attempt to ssolve the Christian facts, leaving Christianity as a system of ideas ır which the facts were but transient and doubtful symbols. The illiant speculations of men like Thomasius and Dorner fell into ɔscurity. It was useless to attempt to explain the incarnation by aborate theories when the very existence of Christianity was in anger. And so Ritschlianism arose, and until the time of the Great Var was the dominant influence in Protestant thought.

It was Ritschl's great and timely service to lead the Church back om speculations to the simple and inexpungable fact of the person f Christ. Whatever be the explanation of His person He has for s the value of God, for He has brought us a revelation of God and f God's purposes adequate for our religious needs—a revelation hich is to be interpreted, not by speculation, but through our xperience of His redemption and our participation in His Kingdom.

Ritschl, like Herrmann, his friend and disciple, was unwilling to dvance from the acceptance of the fact of Christ and our experience f it to the exploration of the intellectual implicates of that fact. Subequent history has shown that it is impossible to stop where e stopped. Whereas some Ritschlians, like Julius Kaftan and Haering, have passed from the acceptance of the fact of Christ's Godead to a cautious exploration of its implicates, others have substituted or the confession of His Godhead a recognition of His unique mportance. Jesus for them was not the object of faith, but only its upreme example. Gladly they acknowledged how much they owe to esus. He was the first true believer in God the Father, the supreme eligious hero of the race. But there they stopped. It is a presenation of Jesus which has become for us impossible. Perverse as are ne views of some of the extreme eschatologists, they have at least hown that the picture of Jesus which writers like Bousset gave can nly be obtained by excising from the Gospels all that is incapable of nodernization. The brilliant attempts to reduce Jesus to merely uman terms have failed. And they have failed because Jesus is too reat to be interpreted only as the greatest of men.

What then should be our approach to the doctrine of Christ's erson? The ancient Christologies tended to obscure the real umanity of the incarnate life. The "liberal" interpretations of a eneration ago emphasized His humanity but ignored His divinity. Both constructions seem inadequate to the presentation of Jesus in he Gospels. The form of His life was human, but its content was ivine. We cannot explain Him if by "explain" we mean to "put nto a class", for He is unique in His place and person. We adore hat we see. We could not have foreseen what we adore.

We spoke briefly of the speculative attempts of Thomasius ar Dorner to explain the nature of Christ's incarnate life. The attempts express in modern form the two great tendencies in Christi thought—the one, to see in Christ the Son of God incarnate; t other, to see in Him the God-filled man. To-day the latter type interpretation is more popular. By explaining His person by t absolute immanence of God in Him this type is able to emphasize t unity of the Godhead and thus to present a seemingly simpler theor Simplicity is not in itself a proof of truth. The explanation of t physical universe by electrons and protons is less simple tha by molecules and atoms, but scientists tell us it is truer because mo adequate. For myself, I doubt if the explanation of Jesus as the Go filled man as well satisfies the requirements of revelation ar experience as the other type of interpretation, which, seeing in Chri the Son of God, is compelled to recognize the manifoldness of t Triune God.

But speculative interpretations of Christ's person, though th have their proper place, are not of prime importance. They belo not to faith's immediate utterances but to its ultimate intellectu implicates. Undue emphasis upon them hides the fact that Christ not so much a problem to be solved as the answer to the most pressi problems of our daily life.

When we try to explain Christ's person we are inevitab enmeshed in the antinomies of thought—the relation of the eternal time and of the infinite to space. Our deepest problems are of anoth kind. They are concerned with the meaning and the permanence life, and with the standards by which our life's tasks must be judge It is these problems which have in Christ their answer. As Prof. Hei says, to know Christ is like entering the choir of some old Goth Church. From outside we could see no meaning in its stained gla windows. But from within its meaning and its beauty are lumino and clear. And that is what our faith in Christ may do for us. It useless, with the old orthodoxy, to call Christ God and man witho first giving to God and man their Christian meaning. In Christ may know what God is and man may be. Amid all that is uncerta we can proclaim with confidence that the God of this mysterio universe is the God whom we have seen in Christ. In knowing G in Him, we know the final secret of God's rule. The values whi Christ's life and death express are values eternal and divine, and must be the values by which we test our problems and fa our sorrows. So understood, the doctrine of Christ's divinity is n a burdensome addition to our faith in God. It is its one adequa support. The person of Christ becomes not so much a problem to explored as a Gospel to be preached.

SYDNEY CAVE.

HYMN BOOK REFORM.

A CONTROVERSY has recently arisen in one of the Free Churches over the adaptation of their Hymn Book to the progress of modern thought and the taste of the modern singer, a controversy which in most churches is inevitable, and in the Wesleyan Church was bound to be acute on account of the prominent position which the Methodist Hymn Book occupies in their history, their traditions, and their theology. A leading Methodist teacher was consulting me lately upon this very question, and my reply to his enquiry was to the effect that whereas in most Churches it might be said that they had a hymn-book, of the Methodist Church it would be more correct to say that the Church was the hymn-book. The volume which it was proposed to change contained everything that was definitely Methodist theology. I referred particularly to the arrangement of the book, which down to the present was so planned as to give a special section to the theme of "Believers Seeking Full Redemption". My interviewer intimated that this was one of the very sections which was thought by the critics to demand reform, though he did not say that it was proposed to reform it altogether. I pointed out that that section of the book was Methodism, and that there was nothing like it anywhere else. He nodded assent, and said, "If that section were removed, the reason for our separate existence as a Christian community is gone". He was quite right in assuming that there was such a body of belief which could be described on one side as Methodist Theology, and expressed on the other side as Methodist Song. It is only sparingly that other Churches have nibbled at this body of beliefs and aspirations, and when they have nibbled they have also frequently mutilated; it was the theology that they were disposed to turn away from, the music of the theology which they were unable to resist.

When, therefore, we find that Dr. Scott Lidgett, giving evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, was asked, "What is Methodist Theology?", and replied that it is the same as that of the Church of England, his answer was at fault in every respect; first, it was an attempt to explain what needed definition by that which was itself incapable of exact definition, to define *ignotum per ignotius;* second, it was not really an unknown product that he was asked for: he should have answered, "It is the theology of Mr. John Wesley's Sermons and of the Hymns of Mr. John Wesley and his brother Charles, especially the latter". Such an answer would have been quite proper. We remember how, when Mr. Moody met the London clergy at the time of his great and memorable mission, he was asked by a High Churchman present what was his doctrine of

the Atonement, and replied that it was in print already in the 53r chapter of *Isaiah*. Dr. Lidgett should equally have replied, whe asked for his theology, that it was in print already. The hymn-boo would be the verification.

This does not mean that Hymn Book reform is unnecessary; w are going to discuss that question presently. We begin with th Methodists because they will have the problem before them in a acute form. Criticism which in other Churches nibbles at the finge nails, in the Methodist Church attacks the vitals. It, therefor becomes imperative for them, in a degree which other Churches c not estimate, to see that the direction of possible Hymn Book Refor should be pointed out, and its limitation indicated.

Now let us turn to the general question, reserving to ourselve the right, if need be, of returning to our starting point, which wa the problem of Hymn Book Reform which has arisen among th Methodists. The first thing to observe is that there is no Church i existence which has not, in some way or other, committed itself t Hymn Book Reform. Take, for instance, the Scotch Church, th most tenacious of any in the matter of out-worn ways of praising Goo How little do they realize that behind their Psalms of David with a apologetically attached collection of Paraphrases, as we used to kno it, there lay at least two stages of strenuous reform to the Psalte itself; there was that Hebrew Psalter in its various Greek-Latin c Latin renderings, to which the people said, "We can't sing that" and there was the English Psalter in which prose is pretending to b verse, of which the people said, "We won't sing that", and then w come to the Versifiers, Sternhold and Hopkins, Tate and Brady, an the rest, whom it would be easy to blame, but just as easy to praise one thing is certain, that every one of them was a Hymn Boo Reformer, whether he knew it or not.

Nor is there any Church that has escaped from similar movement If one may take an illustration from an author whom I dislike, bu cannot always evade, on account of his unfortunate popularity, an if you will forgive a profane reference, you will find in *Pickwic Papers* that Mr. Job Trotter frequented a chapel where they used th No. 4 Collection of Hymns. Here is the passage to which I refer

> "In that house with the green gate, Mr. Weller, they keep a goo many servants". "So I should think from the look of it", interpose Sam.
>
> "Yes", continued Mr. Trotter, "and one of them is a cook, wh has saved up a little money, Mr. Weller, and is desirous, if she ca establish herself in life, to open a little shop in the chandler's wa you see".
>
> "Yes."
>
> "Yes, Mr. Weller. Well, sir, I met her at a chapel that I go t a very neat little chapel in this town, Mr. Weller, where they sing t number four collection of hymns, which I generally carry about wi me, which you may perhaps have seen in my hand—and I got a litt

intimate with her, Mr. Weller, and from that, an acquaintance sprang up between us, and I may venture to say, Mr. Weller, that I am to be the chandler".

ickens, for some unknown reason, never lost a chance of putting a onconformist in the pillory, and I am afraid it must be admitted iat Mr. Job Trotter was a Nonconformist, like those pure creatures the imagination, Mr. Stiggins and Mr. Chadband; what was orrect in Dickens's description was that the Hymn Book in question as No. 4; then what has become of Collection Nos. 1, 2, and 3, hich are implicit in No. 4? Somewhere, some Church has been evising its hymn-book; it was exactly the same situation as that ivolved in the *New* Congregational Hymn Book on which I was rought up. People had been asking for either *Less or More* or oth; they desired both *Old and New;* there were Addition and ubtraction sums in the book of Celestial Arithmetic; and it is not lways easy to see which of the two has the preference. Ought we, or instance, to sing, "Jesus, Lover of my Soul"? "No!", say the uthors; it is too intimate for public use. "Yes!", say the Churches; nd in this case *vox populi* was *vox Dei.* "Yes and no!", say the Unitarians and quasi-Unitarians; let us alter it to "Jesus, Refuge of ıy Soul", or "Father, Refuge of my Soul"; but they had forgotten wo things; first that *Sic et Non, Yes and No,* is no good divinity; econd, that it is difficult for a Refuge to be accommodated with a osom; "Let me to Thy bosom fly!", so they made a further change: Let me to Thy shelter fly!". This single hymn appears to have esisted reform, though I cannot be quite sure of it, till I have looked ıto its history.

All that we have said is to remind ourselves that expansion and ontraction, which are the two sides of any projected reform, are as ievitable in the Hymn Book as, let us say, in the House of Lords. The Christian Church in its first bloom of its first century made iemselves a new Hymn Book. They call it the *Odes of Solomon.* The authorship suggested shows that someone (real or imaginary) as being deserted. David was dethroned, and, as I think I have iade out, they had in Antioch, where the believers were first called ongbirds, a new book of Song, of the highest mystical value. For ome reason it did not hold its own, and I found out, after adding the oil of editing to the joy of discovery, that Christian people were very ow to appreciate what I had found or edited. One Scotch Professor aid roundly that he preferred the old Psalter. I am referring to iis discovery, not with the object of drawing attention to the part hich I myself had in it, but to prove that revision of the Hymn Book s a very old practice in the Christian Church, and not always a uccessful practice.

One must remember that this is not the only Hymn Book which as passed away. That one was for the most part Antiochian in

origin and usage; but what of Corinth, where new hymns and psal were as plentiful as blackberries, and everyone had as surely a psa as a prophecy or an interpretation? Someone will probably say t in any case we could not sing those songs now. This may admitted, but that is the very point at issue. Why do we not si them any more? The answer is because singing is a form of sayi and when we cease to sing, it is in most cases because we have cea to say. "I believed and that was why I spoke" has for a sub-divis the corresponding sentence, "I believed and that was why I sang and a probable added sentence, "I left off believing and that was w I left off saying or singing"; in choirs and places where they si here is implied the *Credo*. This is, then, the general princip "Believe so, say so, sing so".

It will be seen that we are removing the matter from the field technical details, which may affect the structure or the substance a song. That is another matter. If, for instance, the Church England, which has been making futile attempts at turning the *O of Solomon* into English hymns to be used at Confirmation, were put the mantle of episcopal authority over them, there would objection at once taken to some of the most beautiful of the Od For instance, there is one which begins:

> As the honey distils from the comb of the bees,
> And the milk [flows] from the woman that loves her bairns;

really we can't sing that; our Victorian soul rises against reference. Women ought not to have children, except privat ("little folks should be kept in the nursery", though St. Peter bre the rule); and milk may be proper for cows but not for mothers. choir will decline to sing. But these are mere matters of techn reform, with which every hymn book is more or less tinged. So times the reform is necessary, sometimes it is idiotic. It was idio for instance, when the Quakers brought out a mutilated version Lynch's great hymn, "Now are we met", and in the verse,

> An inner light, an inner calm
> Have they who trust his *champion* arm,

substituted the very weak line,

> Have they who trust his *mighty* arm.

More defensible perhaps in its avoidance of slang or worse, is Primitive Methodist version of a great hymn which says:

> On the blood-stained tree behold Him.

The fair speech of one generation may be the slang of the next which case some alterations appear to be inevitable. They do provoke a crisis or imply that one already exists or has rece occurred. They may even occur without being noticed. How m Methodists know that their hymn book once had a different open from "Oh for a thousand tongues to sing!"? In that connex

how many Christians of any sub-division know that this beautiful hymn is a translation in part from the German, and the German is, in part, an adaptation from a pagan Latin poet: can you catch the refrain?

O dass ich tausend Züngen hätte
Und einen tausendfachen Mund,

or in this from Persius's *Satires:*

Vatibus hic mos est, centum sibi poscere voces,
Centum ora et linguas optare in carmina centum.

Notice that Persius admits that the opening is conventional among bards. Some spoiling of the Egyptians there (I don't mean the Germans!); the Wesleys were masters at it. How much we owe to the classical training of them and of Isaac Watts and the rest of the great hymnologists! And how much we have borrowed from the German hymns! Yet even classical terms go out of date and are no more understood of the people. Only recently I was quoting that splendid hymn:

Ye servants of the Lord
Each in his office wait,

and wondered afterwards whether people would understand what was meant by waiting in one's office!

It is curious to observe that in regard to the literary criticism of their hymns, as distinct from the theological, the great hymn writers take different roads. Watts, who was the leader in the new movement for congregational singing, was willing that any changes might be made in single words that were thought to be unsuitable, and he bracketed whole verses for practical excision or disuse. His exact statement is interesting:

> In all the longer Hymns and in some of the shorter, there are several stanzas included in crotchets; which stanzas may be left out in singing, without disturbing the sense. Those parts are also included in such crotchets, which contain words too poetical for meaner understandings (such, for instance, as Wesley's "waiting in one's office"!), or too particular (*i.e.*, too personal) for whole congregations to sing.

And again:

> Where any unpleasing word is found, he that leads the worship may substitute a better; for, blessed be God, we are not confined to the words of any man in our public solemnities:

from which it appears that Watts not only reformed psalmody in general, but was willing to be reformed himself in particular, if occasion should require it.

Very different was the attitude of John Wesley in his famous preface, in which he maintains the verbal inspiration of the Methodist hymns. "Do not let them try to alter them", he says of those who were borrowing the new songs, "for really they are not able". Then he gives a couple of vicious digs at Milton, and says, "Here you will find nothing turgid, nothing like 'pale-eyed' or 'meek-eyed' ". We

see that Wesley shared Dr. Johnson's view of Milton and in particul of the *Hymn on the Nativity*. Perhaps that was only the inevitab attitude of Oxford men to Cambridge poetry; for, as you kno Cambridge is the mother of great poets, and Oxford, which doesn produce them, is their critic. In Wesley's case, where some poet may be conceded, for otherwise how would the hymnary ever ha been popularly accepted, the rule was to forbid criticism from an quarter, so that it seems that literary reform of their hymn book wa prohibited. However, they do not print that preface any longer, f which I am sorry. It was a pretty piece of writing.

Now let us come a little closer to the difficulties involved in ou theme: we pass from the region of literary criticism to the region biblical faith. There are certainly things which used to be sa because they were really believed, which are no more said or sun because we cannot believe them any longer or say them that way.

My own experience began with the doctrine of the Other Wor as painted from the lurid side by Isaac Watts; if I can remember t lines they were:

> Far in the deep where darkness dwells,
> The land of horror and despair,
> Justice has built a dismal hell
> And laid her stores of vengeance there.

There are other more terrible verses, *e.g.*:

> There guilty ghosts of Adam's race
> Shriek out and howl beneath Thy rod.

No doubt this was said more sublimely by Dante, whom Wat appears to be copying.

> All hope abandon ye who enter here.

and

> Giustizia mosse il mio primo Fattore:

but Dante is not in the Hymn Book: we couldn't stand him if were. As it is, the *Paradiso* can't keep the *Inferno* afloat. I went see a film of the *Inferno*. It made the children laugh. No dou they were wanting in literary perception, for it was a very good fil but it is just those children who are proposing to reform our Hym Books. When it comes to the *Inferno*, their pages are blank.

Here, then, is an early experience of my own. I went, long ag to a Congregational Chapel, and in the course of the exercises t hymn was given out—it is Montgomery's—of which the second ver was:

> There is a death whose pang
> Outlasts the fleeting breath,
> Oh! what eternal horrors hang
> Around the second death!

Suddenly I noticed that about half the meeting had dropped in silence; as I was strictly orthodox in those days I sang the loud

but my contribution to traditional belief did not count. No doubt all those silent people came to a bad end, but not exactly the end that the hymn affirmed. There is a special Hades for hymn book mutilators; but I doubt if there are many meetings where that particular hymn could find a thousand tongues to sing it to-day. We might have a thousand silences.

It is not to be assumed that the modern criticism of the ancient songs of the Church can be limited to one offensive doctrine, ruthlessly expressed. All round the circle of accepted beliefs the same process is going on; it affects the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement, and it is not disposed to leave the Sacraments out of its field of view. We need a fresh initiation, a new experience of what St. Paul spoke about when he said he would sing with the spirit and sing with the understanding also. The two choirs are apt to fall a little apart. For instance, people do not see till it is pointed out to them that in Newman's hymn: "Praise to the Holiest in the height", the doctrine of the Mass has been smuggled in, under the term of "a higher gift than grace". Did Gladstone believe that, with whom it was a favourite hymn of a not-favoured author? Perhaps *yes*. Did Lord Rosebery, with whom it was a favourite hymn? Perhaps *no*. Very likely he did not notice what Newman set us to sing. I did not notice it myself till Dr. Thomas Hodgkin pointed it out to me. *Let us sing with the understanding.*

If the old Faith is to stand, we may take it for granted that we shall need something more than the knocking about of the old Song book: we shall need some new songs. That seems to have been one of the key-notes of the Evangelical Revival: it was a new power and a new precision in song. A central instance occurs in Dr. Watts's great hymn: the one with which he opens his collection:

> Behold the glories of the Lamb,
> Amidst His Father's throne;
> Prepare new honours for His name,
> And songs before unknown.

That hymn has a central theological value in the movement of the eighteenth century: I can sing it still, but when I sing it, I say to myself that the germ of the song is in the last line: "Songs before unknown", and that is from Horace:

> Carmina non prius audita
> Virginibus puerisque canto.

The good man found his key-note in the classical author whom he had studied at school. He has spoiled the Egyptians. So it was possible for him in one verse to say:

> Carmina non prius audita;
> Songs before unknown,

and

> The glories of the Lamb;

and it became a Song before Sunrise in the Evangelical Revival. W would be glad of some similar music for our own day.

If anyone will take the trouble to look at the prefaces Dr. Watts's *Hymns and Spiritual Songs,* he will be struck with t difficulty that attaches itself to the work of the Christian Reform when the subject of the Reform is the Songs of the Saints. The go man was prepared to relegate the whole of his wonderful hymns private use if the Churches did not approve of them or thought t Psalms of David sufficient. Here are his very words:

> If the Lord, who inhabits the Praises of Israel, shall refuse smile upon this attempt at the Reformation of Psalmody among t Churches, yet I humbly hope that His blessed Spirit will make the Composures useful to private Christians; and if they may but atta the Honour of being esteemed pious Meditations, to assist the devo and retired soul in the exercises of Love, Faith and Joy, it will be valuable Compensation of my Labours.

The sincere and unaffected modesty of the Christian poet is t best evidence of the difficulty of the task which he had undertake Yet he knew what he was trying to do, and at the end of his life was able to add to his preface a foot-note to the effect that

> if an Author's own opinion may be taken, he esteems it the greate work that ever he has published, or ever hopes to do, for the use the Churches.

Certainly he was correct in his judgment, even if he was judging h own work. The work itself was the result of a demand for a refor of the Psalmody of the Church. If there is a similar demand in o own time, one can only hope that the response to it may be fro equally capable persons as Watts and the Wesleys and John Newt and William Cowper and the rest of the Hymn Writers and Revise of the 18th century.

Rendel Harris.

SCIENTIFIC CHRISTIANITY.

I AM not going to discuss the old and well worn question as to the reconcilability of religious dogmas with scientific dogmas. I want to contrast the scientific attitude to life with the Christian attitude as I conceive it to be, and to point out that there is a great measure of common ground between them.

I.

The main features of the scientific attitude are these: a readiness to look facts in the face, to allow significance to every carefully performed experiment, to sift and compare the results of experiment with a view to discover uniformities among them and to separate and discover errors arising either from imperfect instruments or imperfect powers of judgment. Further, having obtained some relations to which the facts seem always to conform, the scientific mind proceeds to devise further means of testing how far those relations extend. New experiments are suggested and carried out.

Very often in order to visualize what is going on new pictures are formed of unseen elements in the processes. Thus a hundred years ago for the first time the concept of the atoms of the different elements as the ultimate and most primitive constituents was formed. The so-called atomic hypothesis of Dalton was invented. At a later stage the ether was conceived as the background of physical phenomena, and yet later the electron was born in the brains of scientists. Recently Dr. Schrödinger stated that he no longer believed in the electron: it was too simple a hypothesis: the time had come when something more complex had to replace it.

These illustrations shew how the scientific mind lives in the midst of changing hypotheses and concepts, yet it goes on quite content that they should have their day and cease to be. They are but broken lights of the great reality which is more than they. But it has an essential faith that the universe and the human mind will never be involved in an insoluble contradiction. They are complementary parts of a unity. The mind by itself may never fathom the whole, but it may go on exploring. It may make many inadequate guesses. But their inadequacy or inaccuracy will sooner or later reveal themselves, provided that experiments are faithfully and impartially made, logic correctly and ruthlessly applied, and imagination, insight, and enterprise called into play. The qualities which seem to me essential to the truly scientific mind are faith, honesty, enterprise, imagination, humility.

II.

Precisely these same qualities seem to me to be necessary to a effective religious life in the present day. That is my main thesis- and I propose to consider Christianity from this point of view. B first, what do I mean here by Christianity? I mean simply this- putting Christ in the middle of things; or, if you like, taking as working hypothesis that Jesus is the best guide to life in all i aspects. The business of religion is to help us to the fullest ar truest of life. Jesus said "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life The man who adopts that as something to try out by experiment, who by experiment has come to the conviction that Jesus is inde the Way, the Truth, and the Life is rightly called a Christian. B after what I have said his Christianity is not scientific if he does not g on testing it or if he is content to say this is the last word. For hypothesis is useless to a scientist unless he is prepared to allow it direct his work and thought, and not only so, but prepared also to s his hypothesis die if truth may be more fully expressed otherwis And I suggest that our Christianity is not the genuine article unle we are prepared to sacrifice even Christ Himself, or the picture Him that we have formed, if the honest following of His lead ope out to us some vision greater than we have had. That is the last te of our faith in Him, that we are prepared even to lose Hi in following Him.

III.

But this is perhaps going too fast. I had better start further ba and begin with this—that it seems to me that Jesus Himself had th scientific attitude to life. He faced the real world. He had a visi of its significance which cut across current conceptions. He stu to that vision to the end. He had all the qualities mentioned abo —faith, honesty, courage, imagination, humility. He gives us model of clear thinking, He takes no arbitrary short cuts. He fin significance in the simplest facts of nature and of human life.

Think of the world in which Jesus moved—a small country, mos agricultural, with a very marked aristocracy with a strong religio tradition and a fervent national politics. The religion was of a ve definite type, with a clear-cut conception of God as Creator and Judg and an elaborate legal code of conduct, sacrifices, rewar and punishments. The nationalist politics took its form in the fa of a dominating Imperial Power. With each of these Jesus fou Himself in conflict, and He opposed to them not arguments but fac He showed by the simplest of concrete examples that their concepti of God and their hypotheses about society did not work or fit in w actual life.

Take the religion first. Look at the incident of Simon and Ma By the current code Simon was a good man and Mary a bad wom

Jesus turns on them both the light of an unprejudiced perception, and shews them to us in a quite different light. Looking at the people as their inner selves stand so revealed we have a new starting point from which to build up our judgments in regard to what is good and what is evil. Further, if we contrast Simon's attitude to Mary with that of Jesus, we see at once that this clearer light on the facts of the case not only gives a new starting point for dealing with people who have gone down, but makes imperative a revision of the current conception of God. Follow the Gospels through and we find that Jesus cuts through to bare facts at every point. Every one of His parables is an attempt to pierce through academic theology and encrusted conventional morals to the undeniable reality in the nature of the man. "Which of you shall have a hundred sheep . . . ?", "Which of you that is a father . . . ?", "A certain man had two sons . . . ".

And without doubt it is this direct return to primitive realities in our personalities that gives the gospel stories their universal appeal in China, India, Africa, and other lands.

What Jesus did here is very parallel to the revolution that came over scientific thought in the modern era of which Bacon and Newton were the beginners. Instead of trying to fit facts into theories, the scientific spirit seeks always to see the significance of facts; its theories are only incidental to the attempt to get down to greater reality. And in effect Jesus says to the world—you have made a big mistake in trying to fit your actions and human dealings on to the old picture of a God Whose instruments are the scales of justice and an everlasting torment. Try this instead as a hypothesis—that you are all, as it were, children of one Loving Father, Who is longing to bring you into harmony and peace with one another. Test that way of looking at things, and see if it does not fit the facts better. Not vengeance and bare justice, but love is the significant thing in human relations, in helping a soul out of the pit, in enabling people to live together. Try that out! And of course He Himself tried it out with remarkable success.

But turn to the other side—the political. Jesus says to the Jews: "You are surely making a big mistake, you are forming your ideals for the nation on the old wish for power which has become enthroned in the Roman Empire. But this desire for power is a delusion. Power has no roots in reality, the quest of it leads only to disaster". The Beatitudes express the contrary attitude—if these are considered in detail we find that they are not vague ideals, but actual expressions of facts of experience. "Blessed are the meek, for they do inherit the earth" is a discovery made by thousands from St. Francis to the happy beggar lying by the wayside laughing, who could not lend his shirt to the king because he had not one. The story of the Temptation

gives us a picture of Jesus facing up to some of the great crises human life, decisions as to what is the right calling for a man, a concluding what are the things ultimately worth while. The more examine the Gospels the more we find how Jesus arrived at philosophy of life which was consistent with itself in the face of thousand and one different situations. Humility, love of one's neig bour, love of one's enemy, love for the fallen, love for the uncha able, the unthankful, and the evil, this gave a working rule of life be tested at each step, by which decisions were to be taken in rega to all issues. Love for the Jew and for the Roman, for the Scrib and for the publicans, for the Pharisee and the prodigal; Jesus ma the experiment and the result gave Him a conception of the pow behind the universe which fitted in curiously with another range experiences.

"Consider the lilies of the field how they grow; and yet I say un you that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these Some, of course, might question this judgment, but on the whole t closer the examination of the lily, the more wonderful does it see whereas Solomon's robes are more impressive at a distance, like t gorgeous costumes of a play. The human spirit does, in fact, wh allowed to do so, feel a sense of awe in the presence of the w flowers, the sparrow, and all the simplest things of nature, and sense of kinship with them in the presence of the eternal myste Jesus retired again and again to be alone with nature in order to able to recover a clear vision of the world of men. So the man science sometimes has to leave his laboratory, to view his experime from a greater distance and in a wider setting; then he returns to work with a new sense of what his experiments mean, and genera to see how simple it is to correct some error.

Thus Jesus faces life with the sense of a Father Whose goodn ran through all the clash of good and evil that make up life, Wh love is again sensed in the response of the soul to beauty. So cl did this seem to Him that he staked His whole life on it, bringi down upon Himself the wrath of all those to whose basic ideas t thought was fundamentally opposed. So He was crucified for lov sake, and in that act He clinched the absolute truth.

IV.

Now to turn back to ourselves. The beginner in any science ta for granted the ideas presented to him, and then little by little p forms experiments chosen for him by which the conceptions beco clearer and his belief in the facts strengthened. Later he may arr at the full dignity of a research student, and himself make some c tribution to the enlargement of the science.

Such is the position in regard to religion. A beginner in Christianity must begin at the beginning; he will be able in some senses to start where Jesus left off, he can take on trust much that he can read in the story and then begin in small ways to test it in experience. He can try the road of service, of loving his enemies, of seeking the lost, healing the sick, leading the blind, going into the mountain to pray, considering the lilies. These things he must indeed do before he can know the world as filled with a Father's love. He can make his own much of the experience of Jesus, verifying His conception of the meaning of life. But just as the scientist does not trouble to repeat for himself every experiment that has been done before he makes his own adventures in research, so the Christian rightly may assume much of the experience of Jesus, making it his own by the gift of imagination, and may go on to try out His conception of life and its background in the field of men and knowledge around us to-day. It remains for Christians to convince themselves that their conception of God and the universe is adequate to all the facts of modern knowledge and of modern men and women. Here the scientific Christian has a peculiar gift to make to the world. It is not that he has to insist upon a definite conception of God, unalterable and unchangeable. But he has to call attention to the significance of the facts on which that conception was based—aspects of life which are now, as they always have been, in danger of being overlooked. The special experience of the Christian is that love is the great redemptive power, as David Livingstone, Father Damien, Arthur Peill, General Booth, and many another have proved it to be. We have to explore what is the extent of the power of love to deal with the problems of modern society, the problems of the coal industry, of slums; we want men of the type of Jesus, who stand clear of party and prejudice and look into the inner secrets of men's motives, who are prepared to stand by the results of following out to the end the hypothesis that love is the last word; men who are prepared to defend truth, not by fighting for it, but by suffering rather than deny it.

It is often said that Christianity to-day needs a lot of hard thinking, that it needs to be re-stated in terms of modern life. I rather think that it needs even more a lot of hard doing, of frank experiment in all sorts of directions. It is in this sense that I find the value of the Sermon on the Mount; not as a collection of precepts laid down by Jesus as authoritative, but as a series of suggestions for experiment, with some hints as to the results to be expected.

"If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you." It is for us to convince ourselves by trying it that a sense of unity with the spirit of the universe cannot

be obtained while we maintain a separateness from any individu
"Judge not, that ye be not judged" is the assertion of a principle t
essential truth of which we are to test. Refrain from criticism, se
always to understand others, and we shall come to see that this wor
is not under the rule of an autocrat looking out all the time for o
faults. The Sermon on the Mount is most fittingly concluded
the words, "Whoso heareth these sayings and doeth them is like
man building on the rock". The doing is essential. In testing o
the truth of Jesus' outlook on the world we find that we are maki
ourselves impregnable. What we really ask of our religion is th
we should be convinced that it is a power to deal with the evil in lif
particularly in our own lives, and to give us a deep sense of an a
pervading goodness and an unshakeable standard of values. W
cannot formulate a theoretical or philosophical account of all th
until we have sufficient acquaintance with the facts. The Chur
should be a laboratory in which the facts are explored, a fellowsh
of people who are proving the power of the look to Jesus to tackle t
problems of life.

For example, analytical psychology has made clear to us how lar
a proportion of our personal troubles arises from hidden conflict
Sometimes the mere elucidation of the nature of the conflict clears u
the trouble. I am inclined to put the Gospels, sympathetical
studied, in the front rank of text-books of the science of psych
analysis. What about the Woman of Samaria and the Rich Your
Ruler? But as often as not the conflict revealed is a very real on
which seems the more terrifying when its real nature is disclosed a
its origin seen to be in our own ignorance or self-indulgence; a
then what shall help? Psycho-analysis may easily lead us to t
modern version of the man who felt he had committed the unpardo
able sin, and found himself in a hell all the worse because of his ow
creating. To look to Jesus and see His understanding love, to fe
ourselves to be one with that crowd who put Him to death, and
hear His prayer of forgiveness, to ponder His treatment of the fait
less Peter and the publican and the harlot, is not this to enable us
look behind the conflict and to feel an eternal goodness upon whi
we can rely in the very depths of our helplessness and despair?

Or, to take an illustration of a different kind, how often have
argued whether Christianity forbids participation in war? Is n
that putting the question the wrong way round? Christianity is n
a dogmatic code of conduct, it is a challenge to experiment. In 19
some thousands found themselves obliged to refuse to obey t
command of the State, and to their own great surprise this one e
periment lit up a great many dark places. The Gospel story loo
different to one who, adventuring in the spirit of Jesus, has faced
Military Service Tribunal. Knowing he would be misunderstoo

called foolish, egotistic, illogical, unpatriotic, jeered at and persecuted, he learnt perhaps for the first time what it is to have enemies, and loving those enemies came with it, not as a matter of virtuous resolution, but as a revelation of deep kinship with them.

It is then by the way of experiment that we come, each for himself yet each for others, to understand more of the content of life and reality. By this way we come to attach lasting meaning to age-old words like sin, redemption, god. Ask me, "Is Jesus Divine?", I can only reply that Jesus is the light and the way by which I come to grasp an aspect of reality which is eternal. Ask, "Is God love?", I reply that by adventuring on Jesus I find unsuspected meaning hidden in that word love; and find that that meaning is essential to the whole of reality. So I am perfectly content to express my provisional hypotheses in this form: "God is Love" and "Jesus is my Saviour": old-fashioned words yet words that can and do take on a meaning which expands according to the courage and faithfulness with which I try them out in the great experiment of life.

E. CUNNINGHAM.

THE ADVANTAGES OF BEING A MISSIONARY

In ordinary circumstances I do not wish to be in England, ev when April's there. But my wife and children are in Englar A home had to be made for the latter; they had to be cared and educated. A difficult situation had to be faced and m There was the alternative of separation for seven years resignation from the L.M.S., and my wife and I ch separation. It hurts, hurts badly, but there is such a thing vocation, and a clear "call" is not to be lightly set aside. The child could not be left to their own resources or to fend for themselv and the work could not be airily deserted. But in spite of all, looki back over a short business career, followed by college, followed seven and a half years in the home ministry, followed by nea twenty-two years as a country missionary in Madagascar, I cla that being a country missionary is the ideal life and profession.

At home one is almost bound hand and foot by conventi Who, for instance, would dare to finger a chicken bone, or pour scalding tea into the saucer and drink from it?—both sensible thin but "not done". At home, scores of valuable and sacred hours the course of a month are frittered away in trivialities and absurdit on things aimless and inane, a ridiculous and wicked waste of ti I am not writing of those times when a minister may and ought relax, but of the occasions when he is as busy and energetic as a tearing round after its own tail, and about as fruitfully occupi buzzing with busyness which is not business.

The innumerable tea-drinkings! What does it all amount Talk without point or purpose; courtesy verging upon obsequio ness. Paying "courtesy-calls" upon people in whom one is not least interested, upon folks who never have been and never will more than acquaintances, a sacrifice upon the altar of conventi about as futile in the real business of living as a Malagasy offerin cockerel to the spirits. Attending committees without contribut anything of worth, simply because one has not the time or incli tion to saturate oneself in all the details of the concern, which al would enable a man to make a contribution of sufficient valu justify him in spending a whole afternoon upon it. I remem someone facetiously remarking that "a committee is one of the v few things you can get on without any qualification whatever"

Then the minister feels it incumbent upon him to run ove such and such a church, "just to show his sympathy with a fell cleric at his C.E. Anniversary, or at the initiation of the new or fund". He says a few words, of course, the usual thing, bu amounts to little or nothing, and he has spent a whole evening the business. Then there are those "evenings out"; also occasions when he and his wife have Mr. So and So and the fa

in for the evening. Later to bed than usual, the following day there is the "morning after the night before" feeling. I am being strictly autobiographical. During my ministerial days I was often hectically occupied and frantically busy doing "nothing". How much real satisfaction did I get out of it? In review, I was not a little distressed about it all.

And now, switch straight off from that to the life of the country missionary. I am two days' journey from my nearest neighbour—not a bad thing, perhaps, either for me, or my neighbour, or the work. Distance and terrible roads prevent me from annoying him by unnecessary visits, and likewise prohibit him from running over here to irritate me by hanging about the house and "talking shop" for hours on end. I am a social being and love a chat, but . . . !

I have a roomy house set on a hill. I built it myself and made its rooms spacious, with an uninterrupted view of the great forest, and no intervening village—with its pungent odours penetrating our living room even when the doors are closed. I chose the site of the mission house, while many poor fellows at home have to live where they can, often in pokey houses in undesirable neighbourhoods. The minister and missionary alike must live among their own people; our house is only three minutes away from the native village, so it is not a " country residence " remote, with a " no-connexion-with-the-common-people" air about it. Unlike many of the home ministers, we have not to swallow bucketsful of smoke and smuts and fog each week. There would probably be a panic in the village if an ordinary English fog were to envelop it, for such things are utterly unknown here. Some of you could not keep the fog and smoke out of your homes even if you lived in a Chubb's safe.

There are many interruptions in a country missionary's life—natives coming on all kinds of errands or none. But we have this advantage over the minister at home: we can get to business at once by asking the Malagasy what he has come about (courteously, of course), and he always waits for you to dismiss him, for it is almost a point of honour with him not to move until you give him the signal. All you have to do is to extend your hand and wish him good-bye, and that without fear of hurting him, or of his having the uncomfortable feeling that he has been hustled out of the house, and so harbouring a grudge against you. We can close an interview with a hand-shake; you, on the other hand, have to wait for the welcome words, "Well, I must be off!" Never by any chance is there a knock at the door, followed by the words when opened: "I was just passing and thought I would pop in", for there is no European neighbour or fellow-minister to inflict his presence on me. You will think I am an absolute bear; no, I am thinking rather of an English minister's afflictions, for how many people "pop in" and stop in, the whole thing so purposeless. Equally so: the country missionary is never

tempted to " drop in " here and there—not this one at least—for nearest missionary neighbour is seventy-five kilometres away.

The country missionary never gets invitations to waste time t drinking with the natives, because they are not tea-drinkers. Li wise they never "ask him out for the evening", because after th evening meal—about eight o'clock—they go to bed.

The next thing will probably make the home minister ga The country missionary gets seven evenings at home every wee unless of course he is away on his journeys—for we have no even meetings whatever. Evening meetings at home are inevitable; here we manage without them. If only the home minister co call all his evenings his own! We thus have time for readi study, correspondence, preparation, or for organizing this and th Unless we are called out to a case of sudden illness, we are ne interrupted in an evening.

The country missionary does *not* get a morning paper, so he never pinned to his armchair by it for a couple of priceless hours af breakfast each day, reading often what is not worth a glance. I the business of newspaper proprietors to make the headli intriguing, and they often succeed disastrously by eating huge ho into the minister's morning. Nor does the country missionary e see an evening paper or the Saturday *Pink-un*; so that he can w straight from the breakfast table in the morning to his real work, a when the lamp is lit and he has had his evening meal, he can se down to some task immediately, sure of several hours with interruption.

The country missionary also does not have the doubtful blessi of a morning post, bringing shoals of letters, mostly about nothi of importance, irritating the recipient because they need replies. T telephone bell never rings at our station—thanks be! We hav small post-office in the village, with both telephone and telegra but as a telephone call is four francs for three minutes, it is p hibitive, and we avoid it. Even then it would be no use to us, no missionary in Madagascar is on the 'phone. We have almost little need to use the telegraph. The cinema does not draw us fr our homes nor the theatre beguile us from our firesides, because nearest is in Tananarive, 75 miles away, so we never spend lo evenings bored stiff by bad acting, or made to blush by salaci suggestions. We never sally forth shop-gazing, traipsing o hard pavements to the point of weariness, tempted sorely to b something we cannot afford, or worse still, something we not need, for we only have a few native shanties and a sm Chinaman's store. They are both small—Chinaman and store. never waste time going into the city by tram or 'bus to get to a cert station, en route for a certain destination, neither do we ever have wait for a connexion on some chilly platform, or miss a connexion a

let impatience have her perfect work upon our spirits, killing time until the next train comes along, for we have no train nearer than the Capital, a distance of 102 kilometres, and no engagement ever takes us to any of its stations. When we have an appointment in the country, the push-bike or the motor-cycle is ready in a moment—or, if neither of these is possible on the road we have to take, our legs are still in going order. If we want a concert we turn on the gramophone or the wireless, which we can start or terminate at will. We never arrive late to these concerts, and we can leave without being either rude or conspicuous. We never have to dress for the entertainments, or take a journey there and back. Thus we do not increase our laundry bills; in fact we do not possess either a dress suit or a dress shirt, and we discarded cuffs twenty-two years ago. We have some of the latter here for sale, going cheap. We listened-in last evening to the News Bulletin from Nairobi, and then switched on to Chelmsford, but as it was a talk about what is to be shown next week in the London cinemas, we put down the head-phones and tackled something more profitable.

The country missionary can wear what he likes, and you cannot. At present I am wearing a khaki drill suit and khaki collar, and could appear anywhere in my district without a word of comment or an eyebrow being lifted by reason of my rig-out. I would not dare to mount any pulpit in England in this suit; when on furlough I become the slave of civilization again.

I have not to grind out three sermons a week willy-nilly. I am the "bishop" of a diocese so big that, if I preached in a separate church every day, I need not make more than two sermons a year. As a matter of fact, I actually do write more than two in a twelve-month, but I need not do so. I can therefore choose a text or a subject, and let it simmer for months, whereas you have to be ready for 11 a.m. and 7 p.m. on Sundays, and for 8 p.m. on Wednesday, with new sermons each time. Then I am a free agent, for, though I am a servant of the L.M.S., I have a liberty which is practically absolute. I can develop my district on my own lines, and am not afraid of my plans being vetoed by deacons or Church Meeting. True, I am subject to the District Committee—all missionaries—but when one is serious, interference is never dreamed of. I can organize my time as I wish, and am preserved from wasting it (if I wish) by the very non-existence of time-wasting futilities such as obtain at home. And, after all, the elimination of time-wasting devices and ingenuities is a far greater boon than the creation of time-saving gadgets. Dr. Fullerton says that Wesley divided his time into spaces of five minutes each, and was annoyed if any of them slipped away without giving "something to keep in store".

The country missionary can thus find relaxation and change by being able to swing from this to that, and so he never becomes the

slave of a machine; but fools and gossips and people with nothin to think about, or do, burst in upon the home minister, ruffling h temper and frittering away his time, or he himself is almost prohibite by circumstances, or committees, or tea-drinkings, or meetings, tyrannical courtesies from thus dividing his time. If I want a litt exercise there is the garden. If I want a walk there are the breez foot-hills behind the house calling, or there is the push-bike in th shed and the high road inviting me to have a spin. If I want complete evening's reading I can get it, for I have not to rush throug the rain to a Band of Hope, or up into the city to put in an appearanc at somebody's Harvest Festival. Seven nights a week at home Of course, I *could* spend them all making and solving cross-wo puzzles!

This is a great life. There is an opening here for the employme of every gift. If one has a gift for organization he can exercise it the full; to his own joy and the advancement of his district. If o has a love for preaching, he can make his own appointments a take a dozen services a day. If one has a gift for writing, he c enrich the literature of the land where he works. If one loves medic work, all heathen lands will supply him with more patients than can treat. If one is an educationalist, he will find a needy sphere f his talents. If one loves pioneering, there is still much land to possessed, far more than he can cover and church in a lifetime. one's abilities run on industrial lines, he can greatly advance country where skilled labour is at a premium. If one has a kno ledge and love for agriculture, he can employ his gift usefully a profitably. If one is of a scientific turn of mind, he can indulge h hobby in almost every direction. The country missionary enjoys glorious freedom. He is free from overlordship. He is free fro the idiocies and idiosyncrasies of an enslaving convention. He freed from the thousand thieves which waste both time and energy trivialities which accomplish nothing. He is free to tackle diligen and continuously and fruitfully his real job. He does not (or ne not) let the precious hours of the day slip through his fingers w little to see for them at the end, toiling laboriously often on n essentials, but can give himself all the time to the vital things of t Kingdom of Christ. He can give himself to the one thing which has most satisfaction in doing—winning his people for Christ. H is a busy life, but fruitfully busy. A country missionary, with churches and over 30 schools, scattered over an area bigger than t whole of the north of England from the Humber and the Mersey the Scottish border, to visit and staff and administer, w correspondence which runs to almost two thousand letters a ye must be busy. This particular one thanks the Lord that he can on with his job, without the irritating and soul-destroying interr tions of an enslaving, time-wasting civilization. In a review of Al Gerbault's *In Quest of the Sun,* this occurs: "His solitary meditati have convinced him that in many ways civilization has made a f of itself".

W. KENDALL GALE.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL.

I DO not know with whom the idea of an International Council of Congregationalists first originated—probably with Dr. Hannay and Dr. Mackennal on our side and Dr. Dexter and Dr. Hazen on the American side. But seeing that Anglican Bishops met together for their decennial Conference at Lambeth, and the Presbyterians had their Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, and Methodists had their Ecumenical Methodist Conference, it is not to be wondered at that someone should have suggested that the Congregationalists scattered abroad in various parts of the world should also meet together for counsel and mutual encouragement. Though it must always be remembered that "Unions" and "Councils", whether National or International, do not come easily and naturally to us Congregational folk. With our tradition of independency and our concentration upon the local and particular Church, we have never had any very strong and urgent denominational consciousness. It must have taken some courage to suggest a World-Conference of Congregationalists, and I can quite believe that difficulties had to be overcome before the idea took practical shape and form. But whatever difficulties there may have been, they were overcome, and the first International Council convened in London in the summer of 1891. I was not a delegate to that first Council. I was then just a young minister freshly out of College. But I read with eager interest the newspaper reports of the proceedings. I believe I am right in saying that most of the sessions of the Council were held in the new Weigh-house in Duke Street. Naturally and inevitably Dr. Dale—the greatest living Congregationalist—was made the Moderator of the Council. He was in feeble health and it was as much as he could do to get through his address—but that address of his on "The Divine Life in Man" stands out as the noblest deliverance made at

the Council. Another memory remains with me. The preacher o the official sermon was Dr. Goodwin, of Chicago. The service wa held in the City Temple. Dr. Goodwin used his sermon to expoun and defend New England Calvinism. The sermon roused the ire o Dr. Parker, and the next Sunday he did a characteristically Parkeria thing—he "fumigated" his pulpit by falling upon Dr. Goodwin an smiting him hip and thigh.

Although I was not a member of the Council I have often gaze at a picture of the delegates taken at a garden party given to th Council at The Harts, Woodford, by Mr. James Spicer. It was a assembly of really mighty men. I look at the English delegates— Dr. Dale, Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Allon, Dr. Newth, Dr. Guinnes Rogers, Dr. Bruce, Dr. Mackennal, Dr. Herber Evans—and I as myself sometimes whether we are anything like as rich in grea personalities as we were forty years ago. But I must not be tempte to make comparisons between now and then, alluring though suc comparisons might be.

That first Council was sufficiently successful to make th authorities resolve to hold a second. And if it was natural that th first should be held in London, it was equally natural that the secon should be held in Boston. To that second Council I went as one o the English delegation and had the honour of being one of th British speakers. It was quite a strong delegation that travelle across the Atlantic. For many of us it was our first visit to America and we managed to combine a brief tour of New England and Canad with our attendance at the Council. Amongst those who attende were Dr. Fairbairn (who preached the sermon), Dr. Forsyth Dr. Cave, Dr. John Brown, Dr. Bruce, Dr. Selbie, Silvester Horne D. L. Ritchie, Arnold Thomas, and Hirst Hollowell. Of layme there were with us Sir Albert Spicer, Mr. A. J. Shepheard, M C. W. Toms, Dr. A. S. Wilkins (of Manchester), William Crosfiel Ford Goddard, and many others. This second Council was notable success. It had for Moderator President Angell, of th Michigan University. The meetings were held in the Tremo Temple. The Temple is a great building—bigger, I imagine, tha the City Temple. It is a great place for popular demonstrations bu too big for discussion and conference. And that was what th second Council became—a series of great popular demonstration I use that word "great" advisedly, for at practically all the session the great building was packed. I have never attended a series meetings which maintained so high a pitch of interest an enthusiasm from start to finish. Possibly the culminating point the meetings in power and emotion was reached when Dr. Forsy gave his paper on "The Evangelical Principle of Authority". have never seen an audience so moved, so subdued, so overwhelme Discussion after such an address would have been something lik

sacrilege. All that audience could do to give expression to its pent up emotion was to rise and sing, "In the Cross of Christ I glory".

While Dr. Forsyth's address was the supreme moment of the Council there were other great moments too—Dr. Fairbairn's sermon, Dr. Cave's address on "The Living Christ", and the concluding address by the venerable Dr. Storrs on " The Permanent Motive in Missionary Work". Altogether all who were privileged to attend those Boston meetings felt that, if it could scarcely be called a "Council" in the strict sense of the word, we had had a great "season of refreshing from the presence of the Most High".

The inspiration received at the second Council made it certain that a third would be held. This third Council was convened in Edinburgh from 30th June to 9th July, 1908. My own personal view is that the Edinburgh Council was not a success. It was a mistake to meet in Edinburgh. We were not in the right atmosphere. Presbyterian Edinburgh took but little notice of us. Furthermore, a good many of the delegates thought it was a great opportunity for visiting the beauty spots of Scotland, and the meetings suffered in consequence. Sir Albert Spicer was the Moderator, and the preacher of the official sermon was Dr. George Gordon. But there were no great moments at this Council, no occasions on which we were carried to the mountain top. The end of this Council left many of us doubtful as to whether another Council would prove to be worth while. As a matter of fact, twelve years elapsed before the next was summoned. Between Edinburgh 1908 and Boston 1920 the War intervened. Our common experience of its sorrow and tragedy drew Britain and the United States more closely together, and when 1920 drew near—the tercentenary of the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock—the feeling grew that once again Congregationalists on both sides of the Atlantic would like to see one another face to face, so a further Council was arranged, and again Boston was chosen as the place of meeting. Somehow or other, however, this fourth Council came near to being a fiasco. That is not to say that there was not much excellent work done. I suppose no Council had been more carefully prepared for. Commissions had been appointed years before, and these Commissions submitted their findings on the subjects remitted to them in a series of admirable Reports. Those Reports will be found a perfect gold mine by any one who cares to delve into them. But the meetings themselves missed fire. First of all, they were held at the wrong time. They were held in the first days in July, and in July Boston is practically empty. Then they were held in the wrong place. They were held in the Mechanics' Building, a vast place used for exhibitions, and estimated to hold about 10,000 people. I do not know whether the Boston people expected to fill it—at any rate, they didn't. The Council seemed lost in a desert place. Discussion was hopeless. Even set speeches could only be heard

with difficulty. A special platform was run out into the middle o the Hall, but even that did not mend matters very much. It becam evident on the third or fourth day that if the Council was not to fizz out entirely, there must be a change in the place of meeting: so a length a move was made to the New Old South Church. But th mischief had been done, and the Council never really recovered.

When the meetings were over the members of the Britis Committee met the members of the American Committee for plai and frank talk about the future. It was generally felt that we coul not afford a repetition of our Boston experience. It was felt, too, tha if the Council was to be repeated it must become a Council not simpl in name but in reality—a meeting at which Congregationalists coul frankly and seriously confront the pressing problems of the day The upshot of it all was that it was resolved to hold at any rate on more Council, and to try to make it what some of us felt a Counc ought to be.

So from 1st July—8th July the fifth International Council wi convene at Bournemouth. We are assured already that nothing wi be lacking in the way of public welcome. The Mayor—who happen to be a Congregational deacon and a delegate—will give an offici reception, and the Lord Lieutenant and probably the Bisho of Winchester will be there to welcome the delegates. The Tow Council have kindly placed the Town Hall at the service of th delegates. There will be a variety of social functions which we hop will add to the pleasure of our visitors. But, of course, our grea concern is for the Council itself. The meetings will be he in Richmond Hill—a Church large enough for evening meetings bu not too large for frank and intimate discussion. What I a personally anxious for is that our Council should take itself a seriously as does the Lambeth Conference. It *is* our Congregation Lambeth. We are faced by tremendous problems. There is th menace of the New Humanism, with its rejection of the Christia Ethic and its denial of the supernatural; there are difficult questio of sexual morality; there is the urgent matter of our attitude toward Christian Union which is raised by the proposals made for Union South India; there are practical questions of the social implicatio of our Christian faith; and there is the question whether w Congregationalists have something of our own to say upon the things and something of our own to contribute to the solution of th problems which face the Christian Church. A Council that too itself seriously and pronounced its sober Christian judgment upo these and other great issues might give a lead not only to th Churches of our own faith and order, but might do much to educa and instruct the general Christian conscience.

But if the Council is to be a practical Council of this type, two three conditions must be fulfilled. First of all, we want our best a

ablest men as delegates. We want men who have thought and pondered over these questions, who have something of value to contribute. To be a real International Council it ought to be a gathering of the men who lead our Churches on both sides of the Atlantic. In the second place, delegates ought to make up their minds to attend the sessions regularly. The week ought not to be regarded as a holiday week but as a week when we contribute our best in the way of speech and thought and prayer to the elucidation of the questions submitted to us. And in the third place, if the meetings are to accomplish what we expect of them, we ought to baptize them into the spirit of prayer. Meetings which have been anticipated and prepared for by prayer and to which the delegates come to contribute their best under the guidance of the Spirit, will not only be great and memorable meetings in themselves but may become a spring of inspiration and blessing which shall enrich our Congregational Churches throughout the world.

J. D. Jones.

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA.

AFTER FIVE YEARS.

I.

What of Church Union in Canada? How is it working out? What of the difficulties of which we sometimes hear and read? Such are the questions with which one is challenged when moving in ecclesiastical circles in Britain. It is plain that there is room, indeed a clear call, for information and a discriminating judgment on that great venture in Church life, for one is amused, sometimes startled, at the misconceptions abroad in regard to it.

While that great Church has been busy putting its house in order in the vast land of Canada, and on its Mission-fields far-flung across the world, weeds of mis-information, now bringing forth a harvest of ridiculous misunderstanding, have grown up in regard to it. To hear some speak one would think that the Union has been a failure instead of a highly encouraging success.

But panegyric is unnecessary in describing its achievements; a plain tale of work done, and of the spirit in which it has been done, will suffice. Mere eulogy, said to be characteristic of West Atlantic men, can be as harmful as it is foolish, and in some places the United Church may be suffering from that also. But the bare facts will make clear how the matter stands.

II.

The United Church of Canada was undoubtedly a venture, fo unlike most of Church Unions in the past, it was not a re-union o the sundered sections of a particular Communion—Congregationa Methodist, or Presbyterian, but a union of these three in one Church Each had its own history and traditions, its form of Church govern ment and practice; each had stood for its particular tenets i theology, and had sometimes contended against the others in th name of the New Testament and evangelical doctrine. Canadia Congregationalism had its roots alike in England and Ne England; Methodism had also drawn its strength from the Old an New Worlds; Presbyterianism ran out its roots into rugged Scottis soil. All of them, even in the land of their transplanting, had retaine many of their native characteristics; and every one of them had mad its distinctive contribution to Canadian character and Canada' growing national life. To put these three into one united an harmonious Church was the task that earnest men a quarter of century ago set themselves, for the sake of Canada and the Kingdo of God there. They sought a union conserving what was of valu in each of the three, for the good of all, in a comprehensive Churc that would more effectively do the work of God than the three ha done it, or could even hope to do it, when working apart. So wid was their vision that they would fain have accomplished a wide Union of all the chief Protestant Churches in Canada in a nation wide Church; but the Anglican and Baptist Churches, after con sidering an invitation to confer on the matter, courteously replied tha the time for them was not yet. The other three resolved to explo the land and march breast forward to their goal.

Many things were on their side. The urgent demand fo Christian work in the rapidly growing populations, especially in th great West, made working together a necessity. In face of the fact sectarian competition was seen to be folly and worse than folly. A first, territories to be worked by each of the Churches were arranged and co-operation encouraged. Many new Western communitie hastened matters by making it clear that they desired only on Protestant Church with an efficient ministry in their midst. Ever consideration, economic, social, and spiritual, demanded it. Tha attitude resulted in hundreds of Union community-churches in th West loyally, but sometimes impatiently, waiting for the consum mation of union throughout Canada. Further, while the West wa pleading for ministers, whom the scarcity alike of men and mone made it impossible to supply, in the East, in scores of places, sma churches were competing with one another for every family an person, while ministers had neither a man's work to do, nor a livin wage for doing it. The whole situation was a wrong done to th

West, and a degradation of the Christian ministry in the East. Economic necessity, therefore (which also has its place in the divine order) in face of the work to be done, put urgency on men's hearts towards union. Missionaries on the foreign fields of these Churches also pleaded for it and for the extension of their evangelistic activities. Moreover, the Churches had been drawing together in kindliness of spirit, and lines of division were obliterated. Scholarship was making it plain that denominational claims in the name of the New Testament could no longer be sustained. Ministers were being trained together in universities and theological colleges. A new fellowship of spirit and fraternity of church life, seen in the free exchange of pulpits, was at work rebuking sectarian egoisms, leading into common activities, and challenging the Churches with their Lord's desire that His people might be one, so that the world might know that God had sent Him. In this shedding abroad of goodwill mountains of difficulty were laid low, valleys were exalted, and the highway of the Lord was prepared until the Voice plainly said: 'This is the way, walk ye in it''. Earnest men were ready for the great venture. In June, 1925, after twenty years of hoping and planning, sadly lengthened by the Great War and its aftermath, the final step was taken and union consummated with services and ceremonies so quietly dignified and memorably impressive that Canada was moved in heart from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and Mission-fields afar sang for joy. The United Church of Canada had at least made a great beginning.

III.

But there was one discord in the music, one shadow on the feast, one matter for deep and lasting regret; there was a Presbyterian split. It is because enquiry is so often made in regard to these sundered churches—the causes of their separation and their much-reported prosperity—that the matter is perforce mentioned here. A minority of the Presbyterian Church, found afterwards to number 31 per cent of those voting, could not see its way to enter the Union. They have formed, to use the legal phrase, the Non-concurring Presbyterian Congregations. They have called themselves, and, in spite of reasonable protest, persist in calling themselves, the Presbyterian Church *in* Canada, the legal name of the former Presbyterian Church, as if that Church constitutionally and legally by a two-thirds majority had not entered the United Church. Repeated rebuffs at law over bequests have made it clear to them and others where the Presbyterian Church *in* Canada is; it is part of the United Church. No objection could be laid against their calling themselves by any other Presbyterian name, as for example the Presbyterian Church *of* Canada, but the claim to the legal title of

the former Presbyterian Church now in the Union, crapulous maintained, has issued, and must continue to issue, in legal a other difficulties to the hurt of the churches and the scandal religion. Directly to invoke the power of a legal injunction is t last, the very last, thing that the United Church ever wants to d but ever-recurring business difficulties may compel it to have t matter cleared up in the High Court. It has waited long for t spirit of reason and goodwill to prevail; it has sought conference a been refused; it has protested and been ignored; it may have, as last resource, in duty to itself and its responsibility to the future, take that very unwelcome step. If so, it will be done not only wi reluctance but with pain and under the compulsion of some necessi

Doubtless the members of the non-concurring minority had th own reasons for remaining apart, and acted according to their ligh but, as one with subtle sympathies with minorities and an inbo dislike of mob-like majorities and their decisions, I must yet say th with all goodwill to discover it, I did not then see, and have not sin seen, any sound Christian reason for their opposing the Union a remaining apart from their brethren. Least of all do I see why th should act towards the United Church in a spirit of hostility.[1] Fau there doubtless have been on both sides, but judgment must sure be given against any Christian Church that refuses to confer, reason, to settle differences and to right wrongs except on compulsi of the Civil Courts. One wholeheartedly rejoices that in the sett ment of minority claims that have arisen through the recent Uni of Presbyterian Churches in Scotland there have been a spirit, procedure, and an issue that are a credit to Christian men. T manner of it, on both sides, has been almost as praiseworthy as t Scottish Union itself—the very opposite of what, alas, except in t matter of Foreign Missions, took place in Canada.

IV.

Notwithstanding such difficulties and hindrances stretchi across the years, wasting the churches' treasure and consuming t time, strength, and talents of many of their ablest men, the Uni Church at once set itself to its great task, and within six months new Presbyteries had been set up, the Conferences organized, a

[1] For the right understanding of all these matters it has to be remembered tha all the Bills securing property presented to the Federal Parliament and the several P vincial Legislatures, the United Church voluntarily inserted clauses setting Commissions of Equity, with the powers of a High Court, to deal fairly with Presbyterian majority and minority claims. In the Provinces these Commissions w composed of one from both sides and an agreed Chairman. In the Federal Commis the numbers were three from each side and a Judge of the High Court. The decisi of these Commissions instead of being—as they ought to have been—final, were in s cases the beginning of further trouble, because the minority tried to get behind them some Provinces by further Acts of Legislatures. It is needless to say that such eff could only end in failure.

he real problems of a Church earnestly taken in hand. It was imply wonderful how rapidly and smoothly the new machinery was ut to work. But there was a great spirit in the midst, resolved to ake the Union a success. The very obstacles with which it had net, and the wrongs done to it by politicians, only made its members nore resolute to see its plans accomplished. The workers on the ar-away Mission-fields, 95 per cent of whom had entered the Union, vere assured of the Church's support; the Home Mission-fields were urveyed, and plans laid for opening new and re-opening old tations; the Colleges set their houses in order and devised plans of nion; local churches, some of them in their new enthusiasm too precipitately, got ready to unite; schemes to aid ministers who had nade great sacrifices for the Union and were suffering were put in force, for a great undertaking like a Church Union cannot be carried hrough without self-abnegation and sacrifice unto heroism on the part of many; the Church was asked for four million dollars for general maintenance and Missions, over and above local church and Presbytery expenses, and the money was given. The great Boards of the Church—for Home Missions and for Foreign Missions, for Education and for the Training of the Young, for Evangelism and Social Service, for Insurance and for Superannuation, for Literature and Publicity—were quickly in action, so that the spirit of the United Church, glorying in overcoming difficulties, had within a year made he Union an assured success. The remarkable thing in the midst of it all was that, while there was much honest difference of opinion n the Council and Conferences, there were no divisions (with one exception) along former denominational lines. Votes cut across the representatives of the old Churches, giving proof that men were ooking not merely on their own things, but on the things of others. In the midst of such work surely Christian men could say, and did say with glad hearts, " Manifestly God is with us."

Now, after five years, cold statistics handled with a little warm magination can give some vision of what the United Church has accomplished. Fifty thousand members have been added to the Church; 560 church amalgamations have taken place; 500 churches have become self-supporting; 500 new Sunday Schools have been opened; 1,000 new preaching places have been added. In forty-eight months the Church has raised $11,711,959 for missions and maintenance, outside of local church expenses—20 per cent more than these Churches ever gave before the Union, and yet it is courageously asking for more, for it requires an additional $500,000 *per annum* to meet its needs and do the work it has already planned.

But why pile up general statistics? A few cross-sections of the Church's work will show vividly, better than anything else, what the Church is accomplishing. Take Foreign Missions, for the United

Church is essentially missionary. It was the urgency of Missio at home and abroad that constrained the Union. Over the seven se and round the world her missionary activities extend—to Bermu and Trinidad; to the Congo in West Africa; to India, China, a Korea; to Japan and home again to the islands of the North Pacif They stand for churches and preaching stations, schools and colleg hospitals and universities, through all of which the Church seeks build up the Kingdom of God, employing hundreds of train workers to do it at a cost to the home church of $1,005,000.

Home Missions are even more extensive, for Canada is a you nation in the making, and through her gates there pour every ye tens of thousands of settlers, chiefly from Europe. A glance at t metropolitan city of Montreal will show what Home Missions Canada mean.

Apart from her churches for Mohawk Indians and Fren Protestants, both of which are Canadian, the United Church has Montreal a Negro Church and a Chinese Church with pastors their own races; among Europeans, there are Italian, Hungarian, a Syrian Churches, each also with its own pastor; and a Church of Nations, under a polyglot pastor, where others—Jews, Greek Russians, Bulgarians, *etc.*—attend to have their spiritual nee supplied, and receive guidance for citizenship in the land of th adoption. On Sundays they worship in their own tongues, language is of the spirit and what is native goes swiftly and warm round the heart; on week-days they and their young people taught English—an economic asset and a key to many doors—to h them to become Christian, Canadian citizens. In day and Sund Schools their younger children quickly learn the all-conqueri Anglo-Saxon speech, and in two generations are Canadians to backbone and British in their aspirations.

The same story is true of other large cities—Toronto, Winnip Vancouver. The dominating language may change; Norse m take the place of Hungarian, Finnish of Italian, or Japanese Chinese; but the same eagerness to meet men's needs marks Church in all the cities and in scattered regions too. In Toro the Church of All Nations with its chapels and pastors, its recepti rooms, writing rooms, post offices, parlours, pastors' offices, cla rooms, restaurant, gymnasium, baths, is a fine example of Christian Church adapting itself with initiative and resource to m urgent human need. And this is typical of other great cities. United Church is preaching the Gospel and teaching its vitaliz truth in sixty-five languages, and with a comprehensive and ela polity is gathering the children of many nations into the Church Christ. It is not rhetoric, but plain fact, to say that its Missio Home and Foreign, girdle the earth, and on its efforts to extend Kingdom of God the sun never sets.

One more cross-section will show the great activity of the United Church during the past five years in doing work, this time among Anglo-Saxons, that only a United Church can do. In the Presbytery of Montreal alone no fewer than 22 churches have been built, varying from great city churches costing tens of thousands, to the simple yet beautiful country church costing from fifteen to twenty-five thousand dollars. Some of these churches are the result of local church unions and of re-arrangement of parishes; others meet the needs of new localities; all help the Church to do its work more efficiently. The money to build these churches has been got in part from the sale of old buildings, but great sums have also been raised to build them, and all that in addition to local church maintenance and the Presbytery's yearly share in the Missionary fund. And, again, what has been done in Montreal has been repeated in other Presbyteries. Such extensive building is one of the direct results of union and of the enthusiasm to make a great Church equal to its task.

V.

But this article is written for a Congregational journal and the question is often raised: "How and where do the former Congregational Churches have a place in the United Church of Canada?" An answer to that question is all the more necessary because of the strange diligence of some people in spreading the fiction, especially among emigrants, that Congregationalism has now no place in Canada and that they had better settle in their mother Episcopal Church. It would be as truthful to say that in Canada Methodism and Presbyterianism are also dead. But they are all in the United Church, and what is of value in each of them is very much alive there.

In regard to Congregationalism, it is a matter for gratitude, as in democratic days it was a wise policy, that the other two Churches should have given to it—a small communion in Canada—so generous a place. Indeed, it is often said, not by way of complaint, or grudgingly, but as recognizing a value in the United Church, that Congregationalism exercised an influence, and has a place, in the United Church out of all proportion to its numbers. But principles and values to the Kingdom of God, and not mere mass, guided the framers of the Basis of Union. They sought the Church polity that would best meet the needs of Canadian life, freely taking from each of the uniting Churches what would be the wealth of all in union.

The two tables in the ark of Congregationalism are the liberty of a local church to obey its Lord in its own house, and freedom of prophecy for its teachers as spirit-taught men. In the new Canadian Church every congregation has that liberty, while in matters common to the life of the United Church it is expected to obey decisions in reaching which it has had a place and a share through its representa-

tives in Presbytery, Conference, and Council. In regard to libert in preaching, the United Church, while recognizing the value of th Historic Creeds and declaring in the Basis of Union the things c faith most surely believed, requires its ministers and other officers t affirm that they are "in essential agreement" with the faith an order therein set forth. The words have to be noted—"essenti agreement"—so that any bounds set are not of the letter that killeth but of the spirit that giveth life. One is now free to say that for tha the Congregationalists stoutly contended, and, with a fitting form of words found, it was joyfully granted by their brethren of the othe two uniting churches. They too are defenders of freedom in th Spirit to prophesy.

Congregationalists, therefore, whose path is guided across th sea to a new home in Canada, while they may find in the Unite Church some things old and some things new—things they esteeme as peculiarly their own and some things once thought of as belongin to others—will find also an ample air in which they can deepl breathe both as Christian men and churchmen. And what is true c them is true also of Methodists and Presbyterians, for the Unite Church was not an absorption and an impoverishment of the uniting churches, but a union of what was best in each of three for th wealthy life of all.

VI.

But have there been no disappointments and are there no dif culties? Such as would answer that question in the negative ca have had little experience of human affairs or of ecclesiastical arrang ments. In such a large and complex organization difficulties ari and disappointments come every day. But the vexing an thwarting difficulties have come from without the Church: from war as in China; from governments; from politicians; from oth ecclesisatical organizations. Those within, arising in the ordina routine life of a great Church, have been met with such a spirit goodwill to settle them that even the worst of them have not disturbe the happy flow of the Church's progress. Indeed, more constructi self-criticism from within might have added to the Church's co spicuous achievements, for nothing can be more dangerous an where, but especially in a church, than the complacency of mutu congratulation among its members. For churches there is such virtue as rejoicing with holy discontent.

To many whose chief enthusiasm for Church Union was n economic arrangements of a great Church organization wi efficiency, but a deepening and extension of spiritual religi manifesting itself in the whole round of the nation's life, n in passing emotion but in Christian morals applied to personal an public life, there may be some disappointment that such a revi seems to tarry. They hoped for a tide of the Spirit, for an upwelli

of spiritual life like the flow of the sap in maple, birch, and cherry when at the kiss of the Canadian sun the bareness of a long winter is suddenly changed into the tender browns and greens of early summer. But they may have been looking for it in the wrong way and in the wrong things. Moreover, the Spirit moveth where it listeth. A great organization is no necessary channel of its working, nor proof of its presence. Spiritual economics have their own conditions of effective power, and the churches, like some others dealing with commercial economics, have yet to learn that the only way to prosperity is by obeying them, and not by trying to find flimsy substitutes for them. Only by living with the unseen and eternal can churches have power. And yet in the things that have been given to it—in the fact of the Union itself, in the spirit of goodwill so abundantly shed abroad in its midst, in the willingness of its members to work and give, to be patient and learn of one another, ought not the United Church to find proof of the presence of Christ and of His heavenly benediction? May not all that be preparation for a movement that is to lift Canadian life to a new level, in purifying and enriching all relationships—personal, industrial, commercial, and political; and so to lift it up above those things that at present poison and destroy it? To that end was the United Church born, and with nothing less can it be content.

D. L. Ritchie.

TOWARDS A FREE CHURCH LECTIONARY.

In *The Congregational Quarterly* for October, 1928, an article by the present writer appeared under the title "Bible Reading To-day", deploring the disuse into which the Bible seemed to be falling among Free Church folk, and making the concrete proposal that some competent authority such as the Congregational Union of England and Wales should prepare for use in the public worship of the Free Churches a sound and suitable lectionary.

That proposal was welcomed more warmly than the author had dared to hope, being endorsed by Mr. Sydney Moore, of Silcoates School, in *The Christian World,* "G. J." in *The Manchester Guardian,* "Alister Ross" in *The Nottingham Journal,* and an anonymous writer in *The Nottingham Guardian.*

But there the matter ended, and nothing in the desired direction was done.

Therefore, the writer, regarding the need as urgent, for reasons stated in the original article, and confirmed by the writers aforenamed, in the absence of the more authoritative action for which he had pleaded and hoped, set out on his own account for the desired goal. Although his quest is still unfinished he has fared so far, and withal so happily, that he ventures now to offer from the experience

gained some definite, albeit tentative, suggestions towards lectionary for Free Church use.

In doing this the writer has to admit that he has failed to fi much help from Free Church sources. For although there a plenty of liturgical aids available, if these touch this problem at they do it only to suggest readings for the special occasions in t ecclesiastical year, leaving severely alone the ordinary Sund services, which are much more numerous, and in this regard mo needy. For excepting Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, it doubtful whether the Free Churches generally recognize the Chur Year. The remaining Sundays, apart from holidays, anniversari and a few other occasional celebrations are to them just ordina Sundays. And it is for the forty or so ordinary Sundays a year th a lectionary is most urgently required. True, one, at any rate, of t Free Church denominations does offer to its people some guidance this direction, but the selections are too uncritical and casual f the present purpose.

The best help which the writer has found so far is the Revis Lectionary of the Church of England, and to this his indebtedn is great. This thorough compilation does at least recognize so of the assured results of modern Biblical science, and it does co the ground. Yet it cannot be slavishly followed by the F Churches, for several reasons, the chief of which is that it assum and provides for two daily services the year round: it is t assumption alone which makes possible its covering of practica all the Old Testament once and the New Testament twice in the ye How far facts of Anglican attendance at public worship go to just this assumption, happily it is not for the present writer to say, b certainly it has no relationship to Free Church habit, which far fr requiring fourteen services a week, tends more and more towa satisfaction with only one, and that one not with unfailing regulari

So that the lectionary really required to meet the conditions wh obtain in the Free Churches to-day is one which shall be so fram that even the "oncer" shall by means of it receive some impressi of the continuity and majestic scope, the rich variety and the growi force, of Divine revelation as embodied in the Bible. And si modern life is swift and modern populations unstable and v mobile, the period covered by the required lectionary must not unduly long. To cover the whole Bible with Anglican thoroughn at the rate of one service a week, even with two lessons at e service, would take fourteen years, a period absurdly too long. C we afford even a period of three years? At any rate it comes to th that our lectionary, especially on its Old Testament side, must merely selective. Much must be missed. We must use as our O Testament basis a very much shortened Bible. On the N Testament side, however, we dare not miss much.

Though the number of lessons each service has lately been cut down to one in many of our Free Churches, there is still much to be said for the time-honoured plan of two lessons a service, one from each Testament, and any lectionary should certainly provide for two. And the Anglican plan of taking one lesson, at any rate, every Sunday from the Gospels is surely to be commended.

The problem of selection seems at the outset redoubtable, but when once the starting-point is determined and the first step taken the principle of continuity governs the advance, and *solvitur ambulando*. The main thing is to get a start.

And the need for that is, in the writer's judgment, still urgent. As he declared in his former article, "the whole sum of Bible-reading done by many of our people is a few verses heard from the pulpit at one service a week. This is not good enough. It must mean spiritual starvation. Our churches will die of anæmia unless a better way can be found".

It is only from a real concern for that better way that the author dares to offer the following suggestions for a course of public readings for forty Sundays which may be commenced at any time, though he himself began on a New Year Sunday. To some they may be of use as they stand: to others they may give the start which shall carry them to something better: whilst to yet others they may at least be something to go on with until such time as the Free Churches may at length acquire a suitable and adequate lectionary.

A LECTIONARY FOR ONE YEAR (40 SUNDAYS).

	MORNING.	EVENING.
1.	*Ps.* 1 . *Rom.* 1^{1-25}	*Gen.* 1^{1}-2^{3} . *Mark* 1^{1-20}
2.	,, 8 . ,, 2	,, 12^{1-10} 13^{1-10} . ,, 1^{21-45}
3.	,, 16 . ,, 3	,, $18^{1-8,\ 16-33}$. ,, 2^{1-17}
4.	,, 19 . ,, $4^{1-13,\ 20-25}$	,, $28^{1-5,\ 10-22}$. ,, 2^{18-36}
5.	,, 23 . ,, 5^{1-11}	,, 45^{1-28} . ,, 3^{7-35}
6.	,, 24 . ,, $8^{1-17,\ 31-39}$	*Ex.* 2^{23}-3^{22} . ,, 4^{1-21}
7.	,, 25 . ,, 10	,, 12^{1-20} . ,, 4^{22-34}
8.	,, 33 . ,, 12	,, 19^{1-9}, 20^{1-17} . ,, 4^{35}-5^{20}
9.	,, 46 . *John* 1^{1-28}	,, 25^{1-22} . ,, 5^{21-43}
10.	,, 48 . ,, 1^{29-51}	,, 40^{17-38} . ,, 6^{1-29}
11.	,, 51 . ,, $2^{1-13,\ 23-25}$	*Lev.* $19^{1-18,30-37}$. ,, 6^{30-56}
12.	,, 62 . ,, 3^{1-21}	*Num.* $13^{1-3,\ 17-33}$. ,, 7^{1-23}
13.	,, 65 . ,, 4^{1-26}	,, 14^{1-24} . ,, 7^{24}-8^{10}
14.	,, 67 . ,, 4^{27-54}	*Deut.* 4^{1-24} . ,, 8^{11-26}
15.	,, 72 . ,, 5^{1-24}	,, 6 . ,, 8^{27}-9^{1}
16.	,, 85 . ,, 5^{25-47}	,, 8 . ,, 9^{2-29}
17.	,, 86 . ,, 6^{1-21}	,, 26 . ,, 9^{30-50}
18.	,, 89 . ,, 6^{22-47}	,, 30 . ,, 10^{1-31}
19.	,, 91 . ,, 6^{48-71}	*Josh.* 1 . ,, 10^{32-52}
20.	,, 95 . ,, 7^{1-31}	,, 23 . ,, 11^{1-26}
21.	,, 96 . ,, 7^{32-52}	,, 24^{1-25} . ,, 11^{27}-12^{12}
22.	,, 97 . ,, 8^{12-30}	*Judg.* 2^{6-23} . ,, 12^{13-34}

	MORNING.		EVENING.	
23.	*Ps.* 98	*John* 8^{31-59}	1 *Sam.* 3	*Mark* 12^{35-1}
24.	,, 103	,, 9^{1-12}	,, $9^{1-6,\ 15}$ 10^{1-13}	,, 14^{1-31}
25.	,, 104	,, 9^{13-41}	,, 12	,, 14^{32-52}
26.	,, 107	,, 10^{1-21}	,, 16	,, 14^{53-72}
27.	,, 111	,, 10^{22-42}	,, $17^{1-11,\ 32-54}$	,, 15^{1-15}
28.	,, 112	,, 11^{1-16}	,, 20^{1-23}	,, 15^{16-41}
29.	,, 115	,, 11^{17-44}	,, 26	,, 15^{42-1}
30.	,, 118	,, 11^{45}-12^{19}	2 *Sam.* 1^{17-27}	1 *Cor.* 1^{1-31}
31.	,, 119^{89-117}	,, 12^{20-50}	,, 7	,, 2^{1-16}
32.	,, 121	,, 13^{1-20}	,, 9	,, 3^{1-23}
33.	,, 122	,, 13^{21-38}	,, 12^{1-23}	,, 4^{1-21}
34.	,, 124	,, 14	,, 24^{10-25}	,, 8^{1-13}
35.	,, 125, 126	,, 15	1 *Kings* 3^{1-15}	,, 9^{1-27}
36.	,, 130	,, $16^{1-16,\ 22-33}$	,, $8^{12-30,\ 54-66}$	,, 10^{1-33}
37.	,, 138	,, 17	,, 10^{1-13}	,, 12^{1-31}
38.	,, 139^{1-18}	,, 18^{1-27}	,, 11^{26-43}	,, 13^{1-13}
39.	,, 145	,, 18^{28}-19^{30}	,, 12^{1-20}	,, 15^{1-20}
40.	,, 147	,, 19^{38}-20^{18}	,, 12^{21-33}	,, 16^{1-24}

J. Arnold Quail.

BOYS AND PRAYERS.

The following experiment was carried out with a class of nine boy average age thirteen years. The object was to find out what petitio in prayers of the standard type appealed most to the juvenile mi in order that the Sunday School prayers could be drawn accordingly.

Each boy was given a piece of paper and a pencil, and was ask to write down, from his own mind, the prayer he would most like hear in Sunday School. While they were doing this, I wrote ou prayer and a list of six questions on it.

The most remarkable prayer submitted was from the young member of the class. He is, as I know from day-school experien abnormal. If any reader cares to repeat the experiment, and get similar result from a boy of twelve, I shall be glad to hear of it. T prayer was:—

> Father, King of kings, help the poverty-stricken people and sick; comfort the mariner on a tossing sea; and teach us to righteously and keep thy commandments; unite the whole of mank in peace and spread the Word of God throughout all nations, mak them righteous and prosperous. We thank thee for what thou h already given us and we pray that many fruitful seasons of our li may yet come. Amen.

I confess I am beaten by this prayer. Had it not been writt under my own eyes, I should have questioned the authorship.

The oldest boy in the class (aged fourteen) wrote:

> O God, our Father, we thank you this day for the kindness a love which you have bestowed on us. O, Lord have mercy upon that we may obey your commandments for Jesus sake. Amen.

Here, I think, we have a slight departure from the ordinary in the use of "your". The personal contact is emphasized, with the text "God is Love" in mind.

One poignant prayer came from a boy of thirteen, whose day-school career leaves much to be desired. More than any of the others, he seems to make religion a personal, emotional experience.

> Dear Father, Look after us in all our troubles; tell us how to love you and so have eternal life. Make it in the earth as it is in heaven, and forgive our sins. Amen.

Another boy of the same type wrote a prayer of the more conventional type.

> Gracious and most Almighty God, we ask you to help us in all our work and deeds. Help us to know thee, to love thee, and do all we can to help thee for ever. Amen.

Another remarkable prayer came from a boy of twelve-and-a-half, who attempted to write in verse form.

> O Lord, have mercy on us
> And we shall obey thy comands (*sic*),
> And eat thy food, and use thy cloth
> For which we are grateful.
>
> O Lord, we thank ye for the schools in which we are taught,
> They make us clever.
> Then we develop into some kind of work,
> And help ye in yours.

Here we have conscious association of self with God. No prayer, perhaps, showed more straining after self-expression. The writer does not usually attend very closely or regularly at Sunday School owing to bad health. Why "ye" is used is to make the prayer more worthy in God's eyes.

The "problem" of the class showed up: "O Lord, we thank you for your kindness, and for ever will keep (he wrote 'kept') your commandment". His *proxime accessit* showed up this!

> We thank thee O Lord for thy goodness and kindness and laws which you have made. Amen.

This seems to have been copied in part from the following:

> O Lord we thank thee for the food and the clothing which you gave us. And we thank thee for the schools in which we are taught in. And we thank thee, O Lord, for thy laws. Amen.

When these had been collected, new papers were distributed. The following prayer and the questions were given out:

> O God, our Father, from Whom cometh down every good and every perfect gift, graciously be pleased to hear the voices of Thy children as we call on Thee, asking Thee to forgive our sins and keep us free from stains. For our homes and our parents, our brothers and sisters, our teachers and friends, and all Thy many gifts we thank Thee. Make us truly willing to obey Thee in all things and to do nothing which will hurt Thee, or cause us to be ashamed. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

(1) Do you like this prayer?
(2) If so, why?
(3) If not, why?
(4) What would you miss out?
(5) What would you add?
(6) Do you think that you could say it quite naturally, feeling th you were sincere?

The results were disappointing. Little criticism was offered.

(1) Yes—in every case.

(2) (*a*) Applies to God and the children, and tells us to love Go (*b*) Because it goes all right. (*c*) Because it is simple, yet it is pur (This from the author of the first prayer.) (*d*) It is sense, and it about a fair length. It shows the children (in the prayer) to lo God. (The author of the verse prayer.) (*e*) It shows that God hel us, and gives us things. (*f*) It teaches you to be good and obedien (*g*) Because it shows the love for God. To help Him in all the wa you can and to obey him. (*h*) It is asking God to help our frien and be kind.

(4) In eight cases nothing. In one "to love God".

(5) (*a*) And obey his commandments. (*b*) And help us to ob your commandments. (*c*) That we should worship God and ser him.

(6) In eight cases "Yes". In the ninth, "Yes, it could considered sincerely".

From these replies I think we can say that children prefer simpl short prayers. They desire to be considered as helpmates of God, thank Him for His gifts, and implore His aid for the future.

ERIC GORDON.

CONGREGATIONAL STATEMENTS.[1]

I. THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH.

In whatsoever way we may be led to define it, we are all agreed that the Church is Christ's Church. It arose out of His earthly ministry; it exists for His ends; it owns Him as Lord; and it claims a chief place in His heart—even as it is written, "Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it." Indeed, the union between the Lord and the Church is so close that we, Congregationalists, are wont to turn to Bethlehem for the key that shall open to us the mysteries of the *Ecclesia*. The nature of the Church is to be fully understood only in the light of the Incarnation.

In Jesus the invisible God made human contact with man: and in Jesus men saw God in human form. To use Paul's phrasing, "In Him dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily"; and for the purpose of this paper I must stress that word "bodily". God came to us in Jesus that we might know Him as men know men in the common ways of life—"that which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we beheld and our hands have handled". God saw that the world needed that concession and made it, at infinite cost, in Jesus Christ.

> "And so the Word had breath, and wrought
> With human hands the creed of creeds."

With deepest reverence we say that the body of Jesus was a supreme asset to God in His quest for the souls of men.

Did our Lord come under the shadow of Calvary and not know that the world needs supremely, and needs ever, that presentment of God's holiness and compassion that He was making? In the Upper Room I see Him looking round on His little band of followers with yearning solicitude. "Soon the world will see me no more. The world that needs me to look upon and listen to will behold me no more; but ye see me, for where two or three of mine gather as ye are gathered here I will be in the midst, and the world which is no longer able to see me will see you. Henceforth for my unseen Spirit ye shall be the perceptible frame—that which men hear and see and touch. See ye this loaf. It is my body. Take it and divide it among yourselves. So am I dismembered among you. Together ye are my body—my hands to heal and bless, my feet for the pilgrimages of the Kingdom, my shoulders for the painful burden of the world's need. The world seeth me no more, but ye are in the world, and ye see me. Because I live ye shall live also, and ye shall each one say, 'I live, yet not I, Christ liveth in me.' So my unseen Spirit shall live on in the world enshrined in every company of my people".

And thus it came to pass that, after the soul-staggering experiences of that passion-tide, these men, sorrowfully seeking companionship with one another, found One among them whom they hardly recognized and yet strangely knew, and in that Presence were together upraised and upheld.

"The doors being shut . . . came Jesus and stood . . . and said." That is the Church seen from within.

"And when the rulers and elders and scribes . . . perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men they marvelled: and they took knowledge

[1] Two papers read at the invitation of the Bishop of Gloucester at Conferences on the Lausanne findings.

of them that they had been with Jesus." That is the Church seen from without. Or, at least, that is what a Congregationalist has meant when he has spoken of a church—a company of believing folk, gathered with one accord in one place into the Name of Jesus; who, in Him, are of one heart and mind; among whom His real Presence is found, and who, living His life in the eyes of the world around them, become His visible body.

I confess to a conviction that our divine Master meant life to be sacramental in its common ways and not merely on set and formal occasions. Indeed, it would almost seem that He intended to invest as the most familiar happenings of every day with sacramental meaning. Eating and washing (two of our most frequent acts) yield us the Eucharist and Baptism. Is there a trace of a sacrament of breathing (the commonest act of all) where it is recorded, "He breathed on them and said, Receive πνεῦμα ἅγιον"?

Be this as it may, what of that constant human impulse—the "social instinct"? Whether in families, or tribes, or clubs, or societies, men herd together. To meet with his kind is an inborn necessity, a prompting man obeys hour by hour. As surely as he breathes and eats, he seeks fellowship with others. Jesus Himself did; and if He meant to touch our common habits with sacramental grace is He likely to have neglected this outstanding feature in the daily life of man? Did He not rather make of it the supreme sacrament—a sacrament in which the elements are no mere inanimate things, but living, responsive men and women?

How does your Anglican Catechism word it?—"An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace". Outward and visible, like water, bread, and wine; inward and spiritual, like the washing away of the old that the new may be, and the nurturing of the soul with Christ's food.

But the outward and visible need not necessarily be some lifeless substance. Perhaps it may even be that the nobler the elements the more glorious the sacrament. Is not the real presence of the Lord truly the inward and spiritual grace, of which a company of Christly folk, living and moving among men, is the outward and visible sign? "Where two or three are gathered into my name there am I".

You will remember how the *Didache* makes the very elements of the Eucharist symbolic, not of Christ's presence in them or with them, but of His gathered Church. Like this the thanksgiving runs: "As this broken bread, once far-scattered over the cornfields, was gathered together and became one loaf, so let thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom".

I want to stress the fact that our teaching on the nature of the Church is not only primitive, it is highly sacramental. It will be noticed, however, that our emphasis is on the local or (as our fathers called it) the "gathered Church"—which is a Spirit-held and ordered fellowship that in any given place can clothe Christ with visibility.

Before giving a glance at one or two of the implications of such a view of the Church I would sum up in the briefest terms our findings. To us, then, a church is: (1) An assembly. (2) An assembly of believers. (3) An assembly in which the real presence of Christ is experienced. (4) An assembly with a corporate life in Him—a living, loving entity, ever growing and yet ever complete in Him. (5) A visible assembly—one that can embody Christ and manifest Him to the world around.

Congregationalism is popularly supposed to be creedless. Actually our churches, as you will see, are built upon a creed making great demands on faith. But we need our creeds only for the instruction of catechumens

and for that purpose each Church, guided by the living Lord, formulates its own. We might, if necessary, recite such a creed in public worship for the information of non-members. We should not think of repeating it in a church meeting. At best it is only a word picture. When the Lord is present we need no picture of Him.

The churches, as we think, exist for two great ends. The first is, of course, the proclamation of the Gospel and the conversion of those that are without. The Fellowship is Christ-led in the work of the Kingdom. It continues in its own age and locality the work begun in Judæa and Galilee nigh two thousand years ago. By it and in it the Redeemer continues the mission He then began and suits His unchanging message to the changing needs of hour and place. It is the Body in which He is *here* and *now* incarnate and through which He is manifestly set forth as crucified—not merely preached as such.

The second end for which we deem the Churches to exist is to be found in the phrase " the edifying of the body ". As the Fellowship is itself ever growing up into Him in all things who is the head, even Jesus Christ—as the body is itself being nurtured and exercised into the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ—so the novice, grafted into living union, is developed " by that which every joint supplieth ", sharing in the growth of all. And this turns us again to our vision of the Christ. For as we find Him present in our assembly we hold it to be our great concern to discern His will—by no means an easy and casual business, but a discipline calling for much fellowship in prayer and in waiting on Him. Into this " holding fast the head " as the apostle calls it, all members have to be nurtured.

And here is a corollary which may explain one often misunderstood feature of our churchmanship. If Christ is truly present He can be present in no other way than Lord. He must control. And if He is in control there can be no other authority, either of another church, or of honoured officials, or of a denominational association, or of a secular state. Those who ask why we were for many years labelled " Independents " by the outer world will find the reason here. In reality we are the most dependent of folk.

But some may ask " How do you stand in respect to the Church Catholic—the universal Church which we account the one Body of Christ in the world and of which we regard all true churches as branches? "

To us there is one Church in the world—meaning one kind of church—just as you speak of " one baptism ". We cannot find any primitive church described as a *part* of the Body of Christ. To Paul, as we read him, the churches not only perpetuated the Incarnation but also repeated the Nativity in every town and village into which they were born. He does not say to the Corinthian Christians, " Ye are a *part* of the body, or a *branch* of the Church". Instead he writes, " Ye are the Body of Christ and severally members thereof "; and to the little fellowship in Colossæ we find him saying, " As in Christ dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, so in Him ye are made full."

To attempt to broadspread any church on earth into universality is, from our point of view, to destroy its basic quality—its visibility. It is distinctive of Jesus that in Him the universal became local. God the omnipresent took " focus " as Emmanuel—*God with us*. To predicate universality of a church is thus to go back upon the fundamental truth of the Incarnation. A body that is one and yet everywhere has ceased to be that which we see and hear and handle as men saw, heard, and touched the

Christ. No seeker may know this Church catholic[1] in the one way th churches were meant to be known.

Yet we have been always willing—since we believe both in the Kingdo of God and the Communion of Saints—to agree in the concept of a spiritua all-embracing *Ecclesia,* to which all believers belong by virtue of the surrender to Jesus Christ—" the Church of the First-born whose names ar enrolled in heaven ". We regard it as an unseen, spiritual kingdom, nc susceptible of any organization on earth. To it belong all who are le by the Spirit of God—all members of all churches, and many others pe chance whose names will never be found on any of our church, communican or parochial rolls. We should certainly not regard it as being co-extensiv with Congregationalism, or with any other of the communions i Christendom. We should even not regard it as co-extensive with them a if all were to be fused into one organized community. Nor can an community claim exclusive position or privilege with regard to it. All w can do with respect to it is to admit to our Church fellowships those, an those only, of whom we have our Lord's assurance that He has alread enrolled them " in heaven "—that, and *one other thing.* We can b prepared to acknowledge the credentials of any who give evidence tha they are " in Christ ".

And those credentials? Our Master's own test—" By their fruit shall ye know them ". If, bearing the " fruits of the Spirit ", an brother claims to know the Lord, we Congregationalists never withhol from him the right hand of fellowship. He may not see as we see. H way to Christ may have been far removed from ours at the start; he ma emphasize aspects of truth that do not appeal greatly to us; but if h knows Christ we will call him brother; and if in his church he meets wit his Lord we will hold them both true—himself and his church.

That does not mean that we want to make his church and ours or community. There is an old English proverb which says, " Love you neighbour but pull not down your fence ". In the end we believe that w may love our neighbour all the better because we do not destroy ou garden wall. We may be both true men but have different concerns. If may pursue my parable: he may keep goats and be a good goat-keepe and I may grow vegetables and be a good gardener—or, *per contra,* I ma keep the goats. To take down the fence would not add to our real unity

I share with many of my brethren the conviction that not much that of real value is to be expected from our efforts after the creation of unifying organization. Unity is a spirit—love is its centre. Is not *th* the only thing that matters? When once the river flows it makes its ow channel. I enter my plea for the greater unity—a unity which will leav every church free to work out its own perfection among the diversities gifts and administration in which, I believe, our Lord rejoices.

Instead of trimming down our conviction to the least common multip in the items of creed and polity, can we not agree that we will own all wh know Christ, as brethren; and all communities in which the Holy Presenc is experienced as true churches? For in the end the churches exist fo the inward experience of Christ Jesus our Lord and for His outwar manifestation. One Sacrament? two Sacraments? seven Sacraments? hundred Sacraments? We none of us see exactly as do others. But

[1] We have abused the word "Catholic". It gained its pristine value as a roug and ready test of the Christian *faith.* What sanction it may be deemed to possess this respect is lost when it is applied to an *organization. "Quod semper, quod ubiqu quod ab omnibus"* has no vital interest for any Church which retains a vivid sense of th Presence of Christ, for then all the things of faith and polity are under His immedia control.

this Fellowship calling itself by the name that is above every name produces the outward and visible signs of the Real Presence who are any of us that we should deny the inward and spiritual grace?

For the unity of the Spirit there is no need to wait for any conference or convocation—and that unity is what our harassed churches need and our distracted world looks for. "That they may be one, Father, even as we are one; I in them and Thou in me, that they may be perfected into one."

C. Ernest Watson.

II. OUR MINISTRY AND REUNION.

There seem to me to be two things in which we now gathered here are probably alike if not exactly agreed. Our very presence here shows that we believe there should be Church Unity. "Should be", I say, not "is", for though we may hold that there is but one true Catholic Church, universal and eternal, to which all faithful believers in Christ belong, one Church invisible and holy, the unity of which cannot be broken—though we may believe this, yet we are actually compelled to speak of "churches" (as our invitation to this Conference does) and to confess that they are not at one; and I suggest that we are alike in regretting this, in desiring that the way of unity shall be found, in believing that it ought to be found, in feeling under reproach until it is found.

But while we are alike in this, we are alike also in another respect. Surely we all believe that though Church Unity is of such importance, yet it is not of first and supreme importance. If it were to us of predominant necessity, then assuming we are sincere and honest men we should allow nothing to hold us back from immediate entry into the largest of the visible Churches—the Roman communion, unless we dare deny the presence of the Spirit of Christ there. The fact that we do not take that step is conclusive proof that other considerations loom large in our thought—that something else than Church Unity is to us of supreme importance, important and desirable as unity is. Now we shall not be agreed, I take it, as to what that something is. I should very much like those who differ from me to state exactly what it is that is to them of more vital moment than unity. And I want myself, briefly but precisely, to say what it is in my case—and I believe I speak for the heart and soul of the Free Churches. After enunciating this general principle, I shall apply it to the question of the ministry.

If I had to find one single word to express this fundamental principle which we hold as more vital even than unity, I think I would choose the word *Autonomy*. We detest and deplore schism, but we feel intensely that it is better for the Church's visible unity to be broken than for her autonomy to be lost. We glory in our Puritan fathers who saw that it was better far to cut adrift from the established order of things than to share in the sacrifice of the Church's autonomy. But when I use this word thus I am quite aware how easily it may be misunderstood; I must therefore make clear what is meant. It is not the autonomy of a democracy; the Church is not properly a democracy—it is a Christocracy. To us the Church is the body of Christ, the company of redeemed believers knit into fellowship together through the real presence of the Lord in the Spirit abidingly realized. And the spiritual autonomy, the independence and self-government of the Church through obedience to Christ speaking by His Spirit in the midst, the responsibility of the Church to Him and Him alone—this we deem fundamental, this conception we dare not lose even for the sake of the unity we so much crave.

One point requires development here before we proceed. We believ we have high authority for the use of the word " Church " of an individual company of such Christian believers. " I was unknown by fac unto the churches of Judæa", the Apostle writes, and there are many othe references. Of course, it is also used frequently of the whole Church, th Church within the churches, the community of the faithful. On the othe hand, we Independents generally view with suspicion—as against ou Methodist and Presbyterian brethren, as well as against the Anglican bod —the use of the word " Church " of a particular association of like minded and similarly-governed churches in a particular country. We d not properly speak of the Congregational or Baptist Church of England That is by the way, however; my point now is that when we talk of th spiritual autonomy of the Church we mean primarily the independenc (under Christ) of each separate church, where " two or three are gathere together in His name "; secondly, we mean the freedom of every associa tion or union of such churches from State control; and thirdly, thoug ideally, we mean the right of the whole Church Catholic to obey Chris without let or hindrance. These truths we hold to be of the very essenc of Churchmanship.

I want to quote here the words of one who had a far better right tha I can ever have to speak for the Free Churches—and who did speak clearly and emphatically : I refer to Dr. Forsyth. " The Free Churches" he says, " are those that in their genius and tendency (whatever the defect of their practice so far) give most definition, food, and scope, to th spiritual principle in the soul . . . The idea of Nonconformity, if we loo away from its foreign and imperfect forms, is the autonomy, supremacy and ethical quality of the spiritual principle ". He quotes with approva the good old-fashioned phrase, " the crown rights of the Redeemer ".

Notice those important qualifications which he introduces—they wi help us to avoid misunderstanding. We do not claim to have lived per fectly in this faith, to have worked out this principle in all respect consistently, to be more spiritual folk than those in other communions— we are deeply aware of our defects, of how much we have to grow in thi grace, of how much we may learn from others. But we do believe ou churches are of God, that they have been raised by God to embody an safeguard this conception, and that we must not enter into any reunio which does not recognize this truth and restore it to its proper fundamenta position at the very base of Church life. One is tempted to apply thi principle in all sorts of ways—how can it be right, for example, for a bod of Christians to have to seek Parliamentary consent for a change in thei order of worship? But my task now is simply to show what this emphasi of ours leads us to believe regarding the ministry.

(1) First of all, we believe intensely in the immediacy of access to Go in Christ for every individual. There may be many helps and man helpers towards that experience, many operations of the Spirit an therefore many types of ministry in the Church. But in a spirituall autonomous church—built upon the conviction that One is our Master an all we are brethren—we find no room for sacerdotalism. We argue thu on *a priori* grounds, but when we examine the evidence of the Ne Testament we are most strongly confirmed in this view. " We object t the priest—the word and the thing ", Dr. Forsyth says; " the word i deliberately and uniformly avoided for Christian ministers in the Ne Testament ". I might add that the word " altar " is almost as noticeabl absent when Christian worship is under mention. We rejoice in the us of the word " ministry " on the invitation asking us to these Conference

and in the stress on the idea of a preaching and pastoral ministry in the Ordination Service in the Prayer Book; but we cannot but lament the frequent employment of the words " priest " and " priesthood " there and elsewhere nowadays. In view of their Old Testament and pagan associations it appears to us that a sacerdotal rather than a spiritual interpretation of them is certain to be very usual, and that they can hardly fail to suggest to many minds the non-immediacy of personal access to God. We feel this grave peril ought to be avoided, and the words " minister " and " ministry " always employed. We believe, on the other hand, that the Scriptural idea of the priesthood of all believers should be stressed; there is, of course, no inconsistency here with what has just been said—though a Jesuit might find one. All Christians are called to divine service, to the ministry in some way or another of leading others to the Master, and of helping men and women to present themselves a living sacrifice unto God. This does not mean that the Church should not set apart certain of its members for special ministry in the conduct of public worship, the administration of the sacraments, and the exercise of pastoral care. We hold it should do so when it can act as it believes under the direction of Christ—that, in other words, the choice of such ministers is properly always His, acknowledged and accepted by the Church. But we do feel, as a further corollary on this point from our general principle, that such ministers have " no right which cannot be exercised upon occasion by every true Christian, lay or cleric ", and that the value of the services in which they engage and the validity of the sacraments which they administer alike depend upon the spiritual character of the men and not upon the formal character of their office.

(2) We come next to the question of authority—in so far as it touches our conception of the ministry. We believe that every local church has the right and the responsibility to set apart such selected members for ministry; it is free to accept guidance and assistance in the matter, but it must not be controlled. Patronage, the appointment of ministers by extraneous authority, the sale of livings—all these seem to us to offend against the spiritual principle of autonomy under Christ. Here, of course, emerges the question of episcopacy. " We do not necessarily object to episcopacy as a legitimate and often beneficial form of Church government ", Dr. Forsyth says. It is impossible not to be impressed by its long history and wide extension, and it is significant that in recent years most of the Free Church denominations have appointed District Superintendents or Moderators—who with a little more courage and consistency would have been named Bishops. But we *do* feel compelled to raise objection to any claim that episcopacy is essential to true Church life—and we do so on the basis of New Testament precedent and practice, of the manifest and manifold blessings that have attended the work of non-episcopal bodies, and of our fundamental principle of spiritual autonomy. Moreover, and we feel that this is vital, to us the idea of service rather than of authority must dominate in our thought of episcopacy as of the ministry generally. We are deeply impressed by the words of our Lord: " Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you, but whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister, and whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be servant of all ". To us this definitely rules out any possibility of a monarchical episcopacy or of a hierarchy. We observe also that St. Paul was careful to stress this aspect of truth when counselling the Corinthian church : " Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers

of your joy—for by *faith* ye stand ". So too St. Peter, exhorting th elders to act even as he himself in the oversight of the church: " N lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensampl to the flock ". Some agreement, then, seems to me just possible on th question of an elective and constitutional episcopacy—if proper safeguar be introduced on the point with which I have just dealt.

(3) Finally, as to ordination. The essential ordination to the ministr must always be that of Christ Himself—recognized and honoured by th Church in solemn dedication and intercession. We hold that abunda proofs of the validity of such ordination in our churches are to be foun in the evident tokens of Christ's blessing upon our ministry, and w rejoice whenever this is frankly and fully recognized by members of oth bodies. Dr. Gore has said: " I desire to acknowledge as fully and truly as possible the abundant evidences of the action of the Holy Spir in the Free Churches ". And Canon Adderley, at the ordination Dr. R. J. Campbell, said: " To deny the work of the Holy Spirit in you former ministry would, for me at least, be to risk the commission of th unpardonable sin ". As regards the ceremony of ordination, while it natural and seemly for those already so set apart and experienced in th office to take part in such a service of confirmation and consecration, w cannot regard it as their act or believe that any particular set of wor or ceremonial action of theirs is essential. It seems to us incredible th the reception of the divine commission to the ministry and of divine gra whereby it may be fulfilled should be thought to depend upon the presen of certain individuals and the rigid adherence to certain forms—especial when no special direction regarding such matters is to be found in th Gospels. Similarly, it seems very strange to us that, if the validity episcopal ordination depends upon an unbroken succession through th ages, " neither Christ nor His Apostles should have been at more pains institute a form, some precaution or guarantee, of valid transfer ". (D Forsyth.)

Several of the points I have dealt with may perhaps be useful illustrated by reference to an incident that came under my notice recentl It was at one of the Induction services of a friend of mine at a certa church; a prominent layman of the district, known and loved and truste presided; on the platform with him were the Moderator of the Province- our Bishop—the Chairman of the Congregational Union of England a Wales, a College Principal, and several other ministerial brethren. Wh the service was closing the benediction was pronounced—by this layma I remember the thrill this gave me—here was the true genius of o Congregational order, the very spirit of a spiritually autonomous churc It would have been so easy and obvious to ask the Moderator to perfor this act, but what happened expressed as perhaps nothing else could ha done the spiritual principle upon which our whole life as Free Church is based and built.

To sum up. We greatly desire and long for unity, but we dare n contemplate it apart from the real acceptance of the autonomy, supremac and the ethical quality of the spiritual principle. We do not believe w are being asked to do so. We cannot think that a body so evidently a abundantly gifted in spiritual things as the Anglican Church will fail meet us here—sooner or later—and through mutual recognition wo together with us for the restoration of visible unity to the Holy Catho Church.

RODERIC DUNKERLEY.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

A WEEK OFF.

Seven days a week—reading, writing, preaching, speaking, visiting the sick, guiding the young—week after week the winter long: would spring never come, with its week off in the open where sea breezes would send cobwebs flying and give new vim and vigour? But when the spring did come, the plans for a week by the sea went agley: a malicious sprite intervened and the ordinary round had to be continued.

Sooner or later some relief had to be found, however, and therefore, while yet remaining at home, I took a week off. Yorkshire at Lord's, the Australians at Leyton, Yorkshire at Leyton, this would enable the mind to get away from riddles of the universe and riddles of the congregation, from articles and sermons, from manuscripts and callers. And so it did in some measure, though the weather was unkind, bitter winds from the north and east searching the marrow so that the bowlers resumed their sweaters after each over, and some of the fieldsmen peeled off one sweater after another—one, two, or even three—when called upon to bowl.

Half the fun of watching football or cricket comes from the crowd. How often has one noticed a crowd turn on a football favourite, yelling his Christian name with maudlin affection one week, and then jeering at him or criticizing him more bitterly than did Jess Oakroyd the centre forward of Bruddersford United when he is out of form a week later. It has not been hard, as one listened, to understand how easily and how quickly "Hosanna!" turned to "Crucify!".

Cricket spectators are not so much of a crowd, but there are always some types to be found.

We have invariably the man who knows all that is to be known—and a little more. He was sitting not far from me—a little too near—when Essex played the Australians. The score cards were very late in coming round, and so he had a rare chance to shine. Those who had seen the Australians on their last visit observed that Woodfull brought in Ponsford to open the innings with him, but "Mr. Know-All" loudly informed us that it was "Boy Bradman". Bradman had made big scores in the two previous matches and it was all Leyton to a China orange that he would be rested in this match—and so it proved when the cards came round: there was no Bradman playing. But did a little detail like this disturb Mr. Know-All? Not a bit of it. He continued for the rest of the day to give information about the Test team, to call leg glides "nice cuts", and generally to make a fool of himself.

Then there is the man who knows nothing about the game at all, who has come "just because it is the Australians". He, poor fellow, asks the most elementary questions—"They won't leave the roller there when they begin to play, will they?"—a man who is to be pitied because his youth lacked that training in sport which every boy should have.

Akin to Mr. Know-All is Mr. Loquacious. He never stops talking. He has something to say about every stroke. He tells us what the batsman meant to do and why he did not do it, and what he thought about himself for not having done it; he always calls out "one for the throw", and justifies or ridicules every appeal. A troublesome fellow this, who gets on the nerves before the end of the day.

A relative of Mr. Know-Nothing is Mrs. Looker-On. She is n interested in the game so much as in its accessories—the working of t score board or Sutcliffe's hair. Half an hour before the end of play the third day she wanted to know which side was fielding, and on bei told the Australians, she remarked "Yes, I knew that they were t Australians: they're tall: the Australians are always tall!" Shades Macartney!

Then we have the grouser, without whom no crowd is complete. T umpires, the tea-interval, the Selection Committee, the players, t wicket, he growls at everything in turn: "Haig bowls himself t much" (he's right, of course, sometimes); "Yorkshire are always sl scorers." (I looked for him in vain later in the day when Yorkshire w the match by scoring 90 in 45 minutes).

And then, praise be, there is the commonsense type, the man w knows the game but doesn't pretend to knowledge he hasn't got. has never seen Jackson and Kippax before and so he doesn't claim know their very birth-marks, as do Know-All and Co. He probably h many stories to tell of games of long ago. One such talked delightfu to me as he compared sport forty years ago with sport to-day. thought that in most games—he instanced football, polo, and tennis—t players of 40 years ago wouldn't have a look in with our present-d players, but he believed that at cricket they would prove every bit good.

As I thought on these types, it seemed to me that I had seen th all in evidence in other places as well as at Lord's and Leyton. someone say denominational assemblies? Church Meetings? Far be from me to suggest it or to develop the parallel.

And then the players themselves. As I watched, I was struck several things:

1. How well some teams play together! How well they know ea other and play to each other! Yorkshire shone here in contrast with mixed M.C.C. team, with an Essex team with much new blood, and ev with the Australians, who had not yet had time to get together. Wh the shine and seam had gone off the ball and Robinson ceased to swer or when Macaulay changed his style of bowling, the field altered at o to suit, without excitement or commotion.

2. What a great deal there is, too, in knowing your opponents. T never struck me so much as during this week off. A batsman comes his favourite strokes are known and the field is set at once to bl them: his weaknesses are known, too, and the bowler at once begins play to them—witness Chapman's bat hanging out to dry, and the off-s plastered with fieldsmen. Rhodes has not only played for a generati but even this winter he has been to the West Indies and seen a g deal of O'Connor: when O'Connor came in to bat we saw that Rho had not watched him in vain.

3, How well the seasoned players know exactly what can be d in the way of runs—they decide at once whether it shall be a quick two a slow single. And the more experienced the player, the more he c serves his energy. Sutcliffe has taken as many quick singles as m men, but see his lordly saunter across the wicket for a slow one. observe his graceful ease as the fast bowler walks back to begin his r and contrast it with the nervous tyro, fidgeting about with his bat in block almost before the ball has been returned to the bowler.

4. How human and fallible even the best team is. How usual i to see the field flagging during a long partnership, keenness slacken

slowly but surely, until at the end a ball is allowed to reach the boundary that would have been easily retrieved earlier in the game.

5. One could not help becoming conscious too, of the inexorability of time. Had I not seen that umpire's bent shoulders straight and square as they bounded to the wickets to send down balls with lightning speed? And even Rhodes, whom I have watched for thirty years, my boyhood's hero, now shows signs of wear. True, the beautiful effortless delivery is still the same—one, two, three, the bound, and the arm comes over just as it did when the century began. " Cricketer " of the *Manchester Guardian,* has long called him " the legendary Rhodes "; but he must not call him " the ageless Rhodes ", as he did the other day. No, no. By some mischance Wilfred had to chase a ball to the boundary at Leyton. Chase, did I say? Rather, that he had the ball in view for a considerable period: and one felt the chill and dismal shadow of the years fall over the ground. The following day Rhodes announced his intention to retire. Will Yorkshire, will cricket, be the same without him?

Seeing this was not a real holiday, as I found my way home each night I thought on these things and applied them to the work of the Church. Do we people in the Churches know our own team? Do we play together? Do ministers know exactly what their teachers and members can do and thus secure effective and united action? Do we know our enemies—their wiles and their ways? Have we found out their weaknesses by experience? Are we aware at once how special temptations affect our young people and have we prepared them to meet the enemy in the gate? Are we all, Christian men and women, aware of our limitations? Do we reserve our strength for the important things? Do we maintain our keenness through the long day when the fight is hard? Are we on our toes when the shadows begin to lie long across the grass as we were at the beginning of the day? Do we flag when the fight begins to go against us, or are we then challenged to do our utmost? Have we ever before us the quick, relentless passage of time, and do we remember that the night cometh, when no man can work?

Such was my week off. I wish all ministers and deacons could have such a week and profit by the lessons the cricket field might teach. The efficiency of their work might thus be considerably improved—even if they know little about the game, they could scarcely help benefiting. In the crowd one day I was pleased to see a vicar who had umpired for his team in a match in which I had played the previous Saturday—a man getting well on in life, but joining in the recreation of his young fellows. The following week another vicar was playing with his eleven. Playing cricket every week, I regret to see so little of this, especially by ministers of the Free Churches. Sunday's sermons might be a little nearer reality were Saturday afternoons spent in the open with throbbing young life. But if one cannot play or umpire, one would be all the better now and then to take a cricket week off.

ALBERT PEEL.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS.

AMERICA REVISITED.

The Editor has asked me to give some impression of the theologic situation in America. Impression is, under the circumstances, the rig word. America is a continent rather than a country, and to spend fo weeks in one little corner of it hardly justifies one in recording even a impression. I did, however, see something of theological teachers a students, and was perhaps able to form a rough estimate of the gener theological trend in New York, Hartford, and Boston; anything I s must therefore be strictly confined to this very limited sphere.

I found Union Seminary, New York, very different from my recolle tion of it some 15 years ago. It is magnificently situated in fine ne buildings on the Hudson River, and under the wise and genial leadersh of Dr. Coffin, assisted by a really brilliant staff of professors, it is doi excellent work in preparing men and women, not only for the regul ministry, but for religious teaching in various capacities over a very wi area. Needless to say, the work is carried on with a devotion, a kee ness, and attention to practical details that are thoroughly America Though the average student is possibly at a more elementary stage tha his compeers in this country, the more advanced students bear comparis with any that we have here or in Scotland, and there is among the generally a very lively appreciation of the need in these days for ha theological thinking and for the widest and most liberal outlook. T problems that religious thinkers have to confront in New England a very similar to those that face us in this country, though in many respec they are intensified. The general secularization and mechanization life has certainly gone further than with us, and this has its intellectu counterpart in the dominance of a behaviourist psychology which in t minds of many educated people makes religion entirely otiose if n impossible. It was interesting and a little disquieting to find behaviouris entrenched even in theological institutions, and one could not he wondering whether its full implications were at all realized. The intere of psychology which makes more allowance for human personality and f among theologians, and while it is no doubt having good results in helpi to more intelligent educational methods, its tendency to reduce hum nature to the level of a machine is something which really needs to resisted. So far as my own limited observation went there is, howeve great openness of mind on the subject and a readiness to listen to a ty of psychology which makes more allowance for human personality and f the spiritual point of view. This, again, is being furthered and supporte by certain advances in modern physics with which we are also famili in this country. There is, however, a good deal of confusion between t findings of natural science (psychology included) and certain philosophic deductions from the scientific point of view which can and ought to judged on philosophical grounds alone. In America, as here at home, o is constantly confronted by the assumption that science has settled questions and in particular has eviscerated the spiritual world of all re content. Among students, at any rate, this creates an atmosphere whi is distinctly hostile to religion and the religious point of view.

Another factor which has to be taken into account is the prevalence a rapid spread of the new humanism. Mr. Walter Lippmann's *A Preface*

Morals has long been a best seller, and the position for which it stands is welcomed as finally solving the problem of man's relation to the universe and opening out a more sure prospect of advance than any other type of religion. The eagerness with which the teaching of this school has been accepted is a very striking indication of the lack of background which is obvious in a good deal of American thinking. Humanism in one form or another is a very ancient thing, and more than once in the course of the history of human thought have men thought themselves into it and out of it again to something both wider and deeper. The call for self-improvement and self-realization, and the suggestion that only by his own efforts can man really rise, will always make a certain appeal, but in the long run the question is bound to emerge as to the means by which these desirable ends are to be attained. Humanism by itself lacks dynamic, and it is dynamic that men and women need. It is not that humanists are not conscious of this, and no doubt for people of education and insight the mere setting up of an ideal may produce in itself a dynamic of a sort, but the real question is as to whether there is in all this any gospel for the common people; and that question, I am sure, can only be answered in the negative.

The same impression is produced by the eagerness with which the social gospel, so called, is taught and welcomed in many circles in America. It is, of course, true that for a long time past the churches there have shown a somewhat keener conscience with regard to social problems than has perhaps been the case in this country, and at present they seem to be obsessed by them almost to the exclusion of everything else. I could not help feeling, however, that there as here is a great danger of attempting to apply Christianity to social conditions without having very much Christianity to apply. There is no doubt a Christian solution to the modern social problem, but it is certainly not an easy one, and it involves something far more drastic than is generally recognized. America has produced some good books on the subject, and it is all to the good that there should be much teaching and preaching in the churches on its various economic aspects. But that is a long way from providing anything like a practical solution. Conditions in America certainly make it very hard to carry out the Christian law of loving one's neighbour, or indeed of interpreting the term neighbour in anything like a Christian sense. The race problem there is acute, and we in this country should have very real sympathy for our trans-Atlantic cousins in their efforts to deal with it, even though we may feel that at present those efforts fall far short of any real achievement.

We are often told that Americans rather like to hold themselves aloof from affairs in Europe, and that they are certainly opposed in general terms to anything like entanglement. It was very interesting, however, to discover that even if this attitude exists it does not imply any lack of interest in affairs outside the American continent. In the short time that I was there I think I heard more discussion and enquiry about matters in Russia, India, and China than would be heard in similar circles in this country in a twelve-month. Such information as was available from the newspapers, especially in regard to India, was neither full nor accurate, and one felt that India, at any rate, was often discussed without any very clear recognition of the part which this country has played there or of the sacrifices she has made. There can be no question as to the reality of the interest taken in the present unrest and of the widespread desire that America should play a worthy part in helping to bring about a more ordered world.

My time in America coincided with the beginning of the celebration the tercentenary of the foundation of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and was interesting to find everyone in New England looking unto the hole the pit out of which they were digged. The Boston papers were full of information about the early Puritans, often accompanied by some rather startli pictures intended to depict life under the conditions familiar to the ea settlers; but there was also a good deal of quite useful and interesti information about the leading figures in the settlement and about the p played by the Puritan spirit in the educational and social as well as in t religious development of the early state. Professor E. C. Moore ga an admirable address on the subject in the Old South Church, Boston, c Sunday evening, and if the Celebrations now going on are carried out the spirit and temper of that address they should prove not only historica interesting but morally and spiritually helpful.

My main purpose in visiting America was to give a course of lectu at Harvard. The Divinity School there is under the wise guidance Dean Willard Sperry, who is well known to many in this country. It i thoroughly live institution and is doing good work in preparing men f all the churches. I also paid a brief visit to Hartford, where Dr. Doug Mackenzie's long and memorable Presidency is just drawing to a clo Hartford is one of the leading Congregational seminaries in the Sta and has now over 300 students. It has a magnificent pile of buildin though they are not yet complete, and is in every way splendidly equipp I also paid even briefer visits to two of the great women's colleges—Mou Holyoke and Wellesley—at both of which I found flourishing divin schools in which the students have the opportunity of studying the Bi on the most modern methods—an opportunity of which they seem to ma the fullest possible use. As far as my observation went I should say th the American students, whether men or women, are by no means entirely indifferent to religion and all that religion stands for as is son times suggested. There is no doubt that many of them are not grea given to religious observances and seem to lead a wholly secularized li but even among these there is not a little interest in religious questio and some readiness to listen to religious teaching when it is given in open-minded and undogmatic fashion. But there is also a considera nucleus of students in all the universities who are keenly religious in th attitude and eager to prepare themselves for the service both of God a man. Among women there is a real interest in Bible study and in t relation of religion to education. Many of them, of course, are prepari to be teachers and realize the important part that religion will have to p in their future work. The prevalence of this spirit should be regard as an offset to the mechanistic behaviourism which characterizes a go deal of the teaching in some educational institutions.

As far as I can gather there seems to be no dearth of theologi students and candidates for the ministry. Many of these, too, are wom and the problem of finding adequate places for them in the churches is pressing as it is in this country. Those theological students with wh I came into contact struck me as being intensely alive and as having real sense of responsibility. They fully realize the need for spirit power and personal consecration as well as for the finest intellectual equ ment in the ministry of the future. On questions like peace, temperan international relations, and social reform they, and the churches th represent, seem to be thoroughly sound, and able to exercise a power influence on public opinion. Indeed there seems to be some danger America lest organized church life should show too great a tendency

become a kind of political caucus working through agitation and the weight of numbers rather than the leavening influence of truth and moral ideals. To this danger, however, they are themselves fully alive. One of the striking things about modern America is its capacity for self-criticism. It has all the self-consciousness of youth and is fully aware of its own headiness and haste. One cannot but admire, however, its eager, intelligent, and open-minded grasp of the very difficult and complex situation with which it is confronted in these days, and its passionate determination to solve its own problems and set an example to the world. Though the country has no long history behind it, it is very conscious of what it has, and is making history so rapidly as almost to take one's breath away. It is rather the fashion among English people to smile at American hustle and to listen to bad jokes about American manners and doings. This may be harmless enough, but it is well that we should remember that there is a very serious side to it all, and that we should view with the utmost sympathy this nation "mewing its mighty youth", making its great experiments, and preparing itself to play what must assuredly be the leading part in building up a new world.

W. B. Selbie.

OLD AND NEW FRIENDS IN GERMANY.

> "Not that I think so myself, Socrates: only my ears are so dinned with what I hear from Thrasymachus and a thousand others, that I am puzzled. Now I have never heard the argument for the superiority of justice over injustice maintained to my satisfaction."

I have just been reading the *Republic* over again. And when, sometimes sailing along easily, and sometimes forcing my way through the thickets of Plato's involved and elliptic Greek with the aid of crib and lexicon, I came to this passage, I discovered in myself a great community of feeling with that charming and deferential Glaucon. How often have we not all felt the same! I can hear the pleasant cultured young voice and see the *patio* of that tastefully appointed home in the Piræus and the circle of chairs with the soft cushioned empty *fauteuil* just vacated by dear old Cephalus. It is so like the men's courtyard in an old-fashioned Hindu home in the Central Provinces, as I used to see them years ago. The srāddhas and the libations, the sacrifices to gods and manes, the garlanding and the perfumes, all the ensemble of a home where the joint-family of men and spirits are in concord, and where the great mystery is felt and reverenced in all the details of life.

Remember that it was Glaucon and his brother Adeimantus who had playfully kidnapped their teacher at the beginning of the story, understanding so well that gentle and intimate relation which may and often does exist between young men and those who are privileged to help them in their studies. We understand this because deference and affection and loyal hero-worship exist still in our European universities, and are the breath of life to intellectual investigation, making a lesson in language or history blossom like a garden of roses, and as fragrant with thought and memory.

It is therefore of men that I would write, and of pilgrimages inspired by hero-worship. We may not find the apparent goal. We may not discover, even from the lips of Rudolf Otto, what personality and religion *are*, in themselves. I can never feel that Glaucon's search ended in this complete and finished fashion. Probably Socrates did not intend that it should do so. No. Glaucon was still left guessing what justice *is*, in

itself. Even in the *Phædo* there is much talk of immortality—but n proof. The logical part of Plato's arguments—may I whisper it?— always seems to me extremely weak. Most of his conclusions are base either on pure intuition or on premises which even our modern ve fragmentary ideas about the nature of mind show to be untenable. Wh *did* Glaucon and Adeimantus get? Obviously a by-product. Like all th wonderful things in life they found what they had needed while seekin something else which they had supposed they lacked. They sought definition of justice and they got two hours of talk with Socrates!

And if there is any meaning in the great faith which speaks of th necessity of incarnation, then they were fortunate young men, who, looking for an argument, found a person. Which, by the way, is th justification of the tutorial system. Perhaps, after all, they knew pret well what they were doing when they sent their servant to pull the rob of the Sage. It was Socrates whom they wanted. The good talk wou look after itself. It cannot be denied that Socrates was a born talke There was a great deal of truth in Thrasymachus's grumblings. Ar Socrates knew it and was delightedly aware that he deserved some of th not too courteous descriptions of his methods. I found myself lovin Thrasymachus. He felt strongly about woolliness. He was a realis A man who gets angry with what he regards as *mere* talk is always on to be respected. He says, rather too plainly for courtesy, that he can stand drivelling and dribbling.

Just at this point my eye caught the back of Stephen Reynolds' *Seems So,* that terribly frank shock to middle-class complacency:

> Nice 'nuff lady her was; but tisn't no use chattering so long a *they've* got one notion o' what's right, an' *us* got another. The lik o' they reckons justice on things as they is, but us reckons justi on things as they ought to be. They says, "What's the law? because the laws was made by the likes o' theirselves, mostly in the own favour. But us says, "What is it that's right? What did the law ought to be?" . . . *They* says, "What's a man worth?" meaning what he got. *We* says, "What's a man worth?" meaning hisself an' his mone together. They says, "What's just between this rich man an' that poo man?" on the supposition that they'm to stay as they be, one rich a t'other poor. But us says, "An' how is it that one o' em *is* rich an' t'oth poor?"

The lady of the house had left that bookmark in *Seems So,* I fanc Which fact, and the passage quoted, remind us that at least two importa shiftings of the argument have taken place since Plato's time, because w *have* got rid of status-slavery, and we *have* introduced women into th discussion as equals. As long as three-fifths of the population we ignored as slaves, and half of the remainder negligible as women, th discussion of justice must perforce remain academic. When you introdu the working-people and the women, you begin to shift the discussion practical issues, so infinitely more complicated, though more vital, tha pure logic.

Still, it is through talks with people that we do get our minds a litt fuller and a little clearer. Since people have bodies and live in places w must travel to them and use language to convey thought to and fro conversation. I would tell how we made pilgrimage last summer to pu the robe of Socrates where we might find him, in Marburg, in Ham (Westphalia), in Bonn, in Heidelberg, in the Black Forest, and in Stra bourg. You read as much as comes in your way, and your wife rea more and tells you about it. You learn as much German as time a strength permit, and you talk whenever you get a chance, and listen

opportunities offer. Also you travel third-class always, because in that way other English people can be avoided, expense saved, and the whole family can go together.

To be explicit, we reached Marburg in the last days of July, and had lodgings with a young business man and his family. The lady was a Pole, he a Posener who had left Posen after the Versailles Treaty and come into the province of Hessen. We had delightful talks with our host and hostess in the evenings. He had been an officer on the Eastern Front, and had wonderful descriptions of the Russian forest villages and of the patriarchial family hibernating through the winter on the huge brick stove, as he had found them when billeting his men. It was Herr G., too, who explained that he and his wife would always be regarded as foreigners by their neighbours in Marburg, where the sense of local patriotism, and consequent exclusiveness, is very strong. *Kleinstädterei* and *Spiessbürgerei* are the words used to express this local feeling, which many Germans deplore. We have a little of it in such areas as Lancashire and Northumberland, of course, but in Germany it is very general, and disruptive of united feeling and action. It surprised me to find that Germans envy our unity in England. They, with fifteen political parties, think of us as possessing an extraordinary solidarity. Our local and political differences seem to them almost purely romantic and sentimental, not deep-seated as theirs are. They have, said my host, a proverb : *drei Deutschen, vier Meinungen.* Where you find three Germans together, there you will find four different political opinions. They think of themselves as terribly disunited and centrifugal. This view I had confirmed by no less a person than Prof. Otto himself; and recently this Easter, in coming through the St. Gotthard, we happened to be in the same compartment as a Dr. Reuther, returning from Lugano to Elberfeld, who discussed the same problem from another angle : of whom more, it may be, anon.

Of course, as devout pilgrims, we naturally called on Prof. Otto. What I actually did was to invade Prof. Heiler, whom we had met in England, and who is always so generous in friendship to English students. Him I found just taking leave of a small violin pupil, for he is a musician as well as a religious teacher. In his book-lined study we talked a little. Then he rang up Profs. Otto and K. Budde, who both most graciously allowed me to visit them. Here the pen faints. How shall that picturesque little house above the Sybelstrasse be fitly described, how its distinguished and hospitable occupants, Professor Otto and his sister, Frau Ottmer?

The Sybelstrasse runs along the hillside half-way up from the new town in the valley to the Schloss on the ridge above. The houses are higher still up the bank, and their gardens slope steeply down to the road below like some of the gardens in Bath or Clifton. Rambler roses trail lavishly over the walls and hang above the heads of passers-by on the pavement. So that to me he will always be associated with flowers and steep flights of garden steps and a little balcony from which, as we sat at tea, we could look down on the valley of the Lahn spread out below, and the river winding through the middle of the tiny city. Otto of the Roses, he is, to me, a beautiful and fragrant personality. A tall, spare, white-haired, scholar-like man, with strong, thin, aquiline features. In manner very quiet, yet with something of austere dignity and gentle asceticism. On Sunday evening we had a walk with Dr. Otto and Frau Ottmer on the ridge above their home and along the old " amber-way " which crosses the hills there on its course from the Mediterranean to the Baltic—the *Weinweg* or *Bernsteinweg.* It can still be traced for many, many miles,

and of course takes us back thousands of years before our era or the earlies times of which we have written records, certainly to the neolithic people of 2000 B.C., possibly much before that. How curious it is to reflect tha the Greek word for amber, *electron,* has again become one of the mos significant and important international root-words to-day! That as th *amber* trade linked the north and south countries during the early millenia so *electric* power has become again the greatest of international agencie in the hands of men like Rathenau the elder and Hirst.

We talked with Dr. Otto of what our host had said about disunity i Germany, and we touched on the possibility of a United Europe. "Well" he said, "it is interesting to remember that two men as able and well informed as Goethe and Schiller agreed at the beginning of the 19t century that German unity was an impossible dream. Yet under Bismarc it was attained only sixty years later". In the little eating-house where we used to lunch I saw on the front page of the well-known Munich comi paper *Simplicissimus* a coloured cartoon representing six exhausted wraith-like shapes bearing between them on a long pole laid along thei shoulders a huge bag of dollars. From the corner of the picture abov a top-hatted, star-striped, bearded face smiles down at them as they toi along under the burden of interest and reparation payments. Underneath is the simple grim legend: *die vereinigten Staaten Europas!* There i no doubt that many people in Europe believe that the economic pressur of war debts will force the Europeans into that unity which old enmitie seem to make unattainable along lines of pure friendship. Professor Otto was very much interested, of course, in India, especially in the Gandh movement, and when he found that I had lived there as a missionary h questioned me closely about present developments in that continent. H is particularly eager to find some form of worship which may include th advantages of ritual and dignity with clear thinking and mystic beauty and the quiet of periods of still communion, and he and his friends hav for some while conducted such a service as an experiment in an ol church on the outskirts of Marburg. We attended it one Thursday evening. The congregation was of peasants and simple people, and th whole impression that of a quiet Free Church service over here, if such a one could be held in some tiny old-fashioned parish church with flowers candles, and vestments.

From Frau Ottmer we learnt something of the pressure of post-wa conditions on both middle and lower classes. The Hessian peasants i the villages around Marburg, who were comfortable proprietors before the war, are finding the burden of taxation dislocating to their whol previous method of life. Marriage has to be put off until middle age, an economic conditions are reacting unfavourably on sex morals. As i England, the professional families and professional and business people i general have to manage with much less domestic help, sometimes withou any, and the ensuing lack of leisure makes for greater nervousness an less thoroughly digested work.

Of a wonderful visit to the octogenarian Professor Budde in his forest embowered house on the hillside a little farther along, it would be pleasan to tell. Of how, as he sprang up the cliff path to the *Schloss* like a bo before me, he discoursed of the Kenite theory of Moses and dissecte opponents with merciless intellect, in particular the theories of his frien Gustav Hölscher, whom a few weeks later I was to meet in Bonn. W sat in the *Schloss* garden looking out over the balustrade across the valle to the hills of the *Rothhaar* opposite, drinking coffee and talking wit

Dr. Budde and some younger members of his family, including two of the most beautiful children, glowing with health, that I have ever seen.

Dr. Heiler had told me that politically the theological professors are divided as we are in England. Dr. Budde is a *Nationalist,* whereas the older progressives like Drs. Otto and Rade are *Demokraten,* and the younger men like Heiler and K. L. Schmidt (the well-known N. T. scholar) are *Sozialisten.* Of course these words have definite party meanings in Germany and do not correspond exactly to any meanings attached to the similar words in English. Professor Budde would doubtless be a Conservative in England. He does not think that we shall ever succeed in doing without armies and wars, though no one could be kinder to English visitors than he is. I had the very great privilege of meeting and greeting him in England during his recent visit here a few weeks since.

After a week we tore ourselves away from Marburg and travelled north-west for nearly a whole day over the *Rothhaar* and *Sauerland* hills—very beautiful country—and so into the Ruhr and the Westphalian mining and manufacturing area. We had an invitation to stay with an old friend who is keeping house for a Catholic chaplain in Hamm. It was our first experience of a clerical Catholic household. Herr L. belongs to an old middle-class landed proprietor family. He is a delightful man with a disciplined and entirely unself-conscious ascetic piety very attractive as joined to his interesting personality. Our friend herself is a Catholic. Her family were of official rank, her father having been the principal resident stipendiary magistrate in the city before the war, during which she and her mother lost all they had and nearly starved to death. Herr L. is chaplain to the gaol, as well as honorary chaplain to the hospital. I had never before realized so clearly the real value of the traditional seven years' disciplinary training of the Roman priest, nor the very severe mental strain of a confessor's work in the case of a delicate man. After two hours in the confessional he comes back quite exhausted. When to the very high moral level of the old German gentry is added the exacting pietist discipline prescribed for a Catholic clergyman the result is a beautiful type of character, but also a life which makes very severe calls on the physical constitution.

We left Hamm with a better understanding of the work and value of northern Catholicism and a greater and more sympathetic respect for its clergy. A few hours brought us to Köln and thence to sunny, flowery Bonn, where we found rooms in the *Poppelsdorferallee* next door to the Oriental Seminar. Here we called one evening on an old friend, Prof. Kahle, the director of the Oriental Languages School, who gave me an introduction to Prof. G. Hölscher, lately come to Bonn from Marburg. I went in to see Dr. Hölscher at 10.30 one morning and stayed talking alternately in English and German until 1.0. He is a young middle-aged man, clean shaven, with grey hair, a keen, thin face, the brightest, most kindly eyes which follow each point in a conversation with absorbing interest. He is a republican and a pacifist, and inclined to move forward both in criticism and in theology. We seemed to have so much to say to each other and to be so much in accord. His deeply religious type of faith was very attractive and beautiful to me. Frau Hölscher is a Norwegian lady, and perhaps that has been a factor in keeping her husband's mind in the direction of progressive thought and internationalism. We discussed together the connexion of religion with economics and politics, the necessity of retaining the Bible in the Christian Church, and a hundred and one questions which interested us both. Dr. Hölscher feels that the German Protestant spirit is still apt to be too nationalist (in the general,

not the party, sense of the word). In Bonn he finds that the Catholics support the republic, as do the non-religious societies. The Protestants tend to hold aloof. In the evening we were invited in again to meet Frau Hölscher, and saw their two sons, 17 and 15 years old, most charming boys, who had just been tramping the forests for their holiday at a cost of about 3d. a day. "Boys", he tells them, "you are going for your summer holiday. Do stay away longer. You cost so little when you're on vacation". That is the effect of the *Jugendherbergen* where the young people put up for a few pfennigs a night when tramping.

People sometimes think of theological professors as dull, detached from life, gloomy, uninteresting and unimportant. I wish such people could meet Gustav Hölscher and his family. He strengthened my belief that sound scholarship is necessary for healthy religion, and that healthy religion lies at the back of, and is a necessity for, all progressive political and economic thought and action. Many things seen and heard in Germany added to the definiteness of that belief. For example, from Marburg ridge we could see the Amoneburg to the north, a sugar-loaf-shaped hillock on the plain, where S. Boniface put one of the first Christian settlements about 750 A.D. And when, after Bonn, we had an entrancing fortnight in Heidelberg, and climbed above the Philosophers' Way through the woods across the Neckar, to the Heiligenberg, I realized still more what Christianity had meant to Germany in the eighth and ninth centuries; especially as I had just been reading about this period in Michaelis's *History of Germany,* which was on Herr L.'s bookshelves in Hamm. Here are the ruins of an old fortified monastery planted in the middle of the forest by monks who were introducing the new methods of agriculture, reading, and writing, and what was known of medicine; who, in a word, were the agents of a new civilization. I thought of the missionary settlements in Central Africa to-day and how they have prevented the rush of Westernism from enslaving the negro, and have interpreted it to him and him to it. There is, I am sure, a right and a healthy connexion between religious propaganda and the new surgery, new economic life, new agriculture, new political adjustments. Without more adequate philosophical ideas, without a deeper and more intelligent faith, the general advance will be held up. So that it was natural that we should, after Heidelberg and a fortnight with the new open-air young Germany on the river there, go on to Königsfeld, climbing up a winding narrow-gauge line for half a day through the pine woods of the Black Forest, to see Dr. and Mdme. Schweitzer before they left again for West Africa. He is getting greyer now. Even his gigantic strength is breaking down under the constant toil of his work as missionary and writer. We sat in the forest with him and fed the wild squirrels, which come to take food out of Mdme. Schweitzer's hand, and one day went over to Villingen and saw the museum there and realized something of what the Knights of S. John had done for Europe. For in that museum is a porcelain relief panel portraying the great sea fight at Rhodes which kept the Saracen out of Europe for a half-century—a picture composed by a Villingen craftsman from the description furnished to him by the head of the Convent of S. John in Villingen who had been present at the fight. So in the Middle Ages men and money went from many little cities in Western Europe to swell the forces which held the gate of Christian civilization in Rhodes. And there, a few miles away in Königsfeld, was a greater Christian knight preparing to leave for the frontier struggle with superstition and disease in the strategic area of our day—Africa. What if the Convent of S. John in Villingen in the 14th century had asked what con-

nexion remote Rhodes could possibly have with them that they should send men and money to it! Nowadays remote Villingen, 4,000 ft. above sea level, is the halting station for the aeroplane which flies daily from Karlsbad to Constance, and the town partakes all the highly organized life of the Europe it helped to save!

Was it not a fitting conclusion to such a series of interesting meetings that we should spend our last Sunday in Strasbourg with our old friends Prof. and Mdme. Hauter, and should walk with them in the Orangerie? There Prof. Hauter and I discussed the difference between French and English colonial policy. Dr. Hauter is a very live man. He is Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in the Protestant Thelogical Faculty, but in the course of his duties he lectures on the great contemporary writers of Europe and the bearing of their views of life on religious faith and the mentality of the European to-day. Lectures on Shaw and Galsworthy as part of the theological course! Whilst in Marburg Heiler is lecturing on Indian faith and Indian religious thought as part of the prescribed training for the ministry. Such a conception of the scope of theological studies may seem to some to make for vagueness perhaps. But I came back more sure than ever that a theological course which does not attempt to *relate* Christian faith to contemporary economic and political thought is somehow failing in its duty.

We sat at the feet of the wise and earnest, and even if we came away bewildered we had at least been stirred and awakened.

J. P. Naish.

Contemporary American Philosophy. Personal Statements. Edited by George P. Adams and Wm. P. Montague. Allen & Unwin. Two vols. 16s. each.

The method of *Selbstdarstellungen* by philosophers or theologians comes to us from Germany, but it has already been acclimatized in this country in the two volumes of *Contemporary British Philosophy* edited by Professor J. H. Muirhead. Now we have a counterpart to those volumes, published by the same firm, in which leading American philosophers of the present day—no less than thirty-four of them—in turn give short expositions of their general views. The idea of the statements is that they should be at once autobiographical and systematic. They are to explain the author's present position through the way in which he came to it. But the actual practice of the different writers varies a good deal. Some are more concerned with what they now believe than with the history of their mental development. Others act in just the reverse way, and are occupied more with historical retrospect than with positive statement.

Nevertheless, the total result, perhaps partly as the consequence of these widely divergent styles and methods, gives a very vivid picture of the present position of philosophy in the United States, which cannot but be deeply interesting to us in this country, sharing as we do with America the same language and many common presuppositions. Among the American philosophers represented in the volumes before us are many whose names are familiar on this side of the Atlantic. There is perhaps no one of them who has been so widely read among us as were William James and Josiah Royce. But Dewey and Santayana are very well known in England, and there are many others whose names recall valuable works from which we have profited greatly.

It would be hopeless in a short review to attempt to deal with individual statements, nor would it be fair treatment to pick out and comment on those emanating from the men with whom we are most familiar. But

there is a better method of bringing out the importance and meaning of these full volumes. It is to consider the way in which they illustrate the development of philosophy in America during the last sixty or seventy years. Some of the oldest writers take us back to a time when philosophy in American colleges was purely ancillary to theology, when it was taught exclusively by ministers, when the Scottish common-sense philosophy was dominant, and "intuition" was the magic word that solved all difficulties. Then we see the importation of German philosophy and the exportation of promising students to Germany, there to take the Ph.D. degree. We meet with the establishment of philosophical research in America and the separation of philosophy from theological leading-strings. Two mighty influences mark the turn of the century as the culmination of this development. One is Royce, through whom German idealism flowers anew in America. The other is William James, physician, empiricist, brilliant psychologist, pragmatist, and pluralist. He is the force that has brought America, partly through a reversion to Locke and Hume, into its present philosophical situation. With the present century Dewey begins to speak, and American realism is fairly launched upon its way—the new type of philosophy which, while acknowledging its indebtedness to James, yet disowns the element of subjectivism still present in him, and seeks everywhere to establish truth upon an entirely objective basis.

Looking at *Contemporary American Philosophy* as a whole, one gets the impression that realism has come in like a flood. There are idealist islands still unsubmerged, and there are many cross-currents within the new realism itself. But there can be no mistaking the portent. It is the school of Dewey that is uppermost. The younger philosophers tend to be realists—with them idealism is out of fashion.

From this point of view it may be worth while after all to single out a particular statement and quote a couple of sentences from Dewey himself:

> "The objective biological approach of the Jamesian psychology led straight to the perception of the importance of distinctive social categories, especially communication and participation. It is my conviction that a great deal of our philosophizing needs to be done over again from this point of view, and that there will ultimately result an integrated synthesis in a philosophy congruous with modern science and related to actual needs in education, morals and religion."

We must say: *Non tali auxilio.* The aim is admirable, but an "objective biological approach" can never lead to the absolute values with which alone morals and religion can be satisfied.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London, and the date 1930 *unless otherwise stated.)*

" That Devil Wilkes." By RAYMOND POSTGATE. Constable. 14/-.

A Life of John Wilkes. By O. A. SHERRARD. Allen & Unwin. 10/6.

Byron. By ANDRE MAUROIS. Cape. 12/6.

Lord Melbourne. By BERTRAM NEWMAN. Macmillan. 12/6.

Froude and Carlyle. By WALDO H. DUNN. Longmans. 15/-.

The Later Years of Thomas Hardy, 1892-1928. Macmillan. 18/-.

Mary Gladstone: Her Diaries and Her Letters. Methuen. 21/-.

Letters of George Sand. Routledge. 15/-.

Lincoln. By EMIL LUDWIG. Putnam. 21/-.

About Myself. By BEN TURNER. Toulmin. 10/6.

Lenin and Gandhi. By RENE FULOP-MILLER. Putnam. 7/6.

It is unfortunate for the publishers when two books on the same subject appear exactly at the same time, and especially so when they treat the subject from the same angle. Mr. Postgate and Mr. Sherrard have both determined to say what is to be said for Jack Wilkes, though not even they are sufficiently his champions to go the length of complete whitewashing! Mr. Sherrard, however, is inclined to make Wilkes a hero, and to see only one blemish in his character—even he has to confess that Wilkes was a libertine—while Mr. Postgate evidently approves the verdict of Wilkes's son-in-law:

> " His motives were, I believe, public motives; I know nothing that should make me think otherwise. He might be wrong, but, I am persuaded, he was sincere ".

So violently was Wilkes denounced in his own day that we start our study of him with a sympathetic bias, and we are glad that history is offering him compensations by emphasizing his services to freedom and democracy, and lauding his courage and pertinacity. Once more, however, we are dissatisfied with the accounts of Wilkes's last years: the explanations of why he so easily accepted the " extinct volcano " rôle seem altogether inadequate.

The simultaneous publication of the books offers the reviewer the opportunity of comparison. Both are well written: Mr. Sherrard's is the sprightlier, perhaps Mr. Postgate's the more reliable. We enjoyed Mr. Sherrard's the better, possibly because we read it first, possibly because he did not oblige us to keep turning to the end for notes!

M. André Maurois chooses his subjects with a true instinct. We can think of no figures in British history that would suit him better than

Disraeli and Byron. Both of them were realists who had little of conscience in what they did; both of them were essentially selfish, counting other people but as means to serve their ambitions or satisfy their passions. The same feeling that makes the French to-day look on security as the great end of policy, and armed force as the only means to security, can be seen in both Disraeli and Byron, and it is therefore not difficult to understand that a Frenchman has been able to delineate their characters with such skill.

In his *Byron*, admirably translated by Mr. Hamish Miles, M. Maurois depicts again that strange figure that held the stage for a brief moment, a figure so strange that it is easy to see why often men (and still more often women) wondered if he were sane. The orgies that marked Byron's life afflict with nausea men who are far from being Puritan in outlook, and we are not disposed to sympathize with Byron as "the innocent victim of his blood's fatality" to use M. Maurois' phrase: rather are we inclined to sympathize with those who had to live with him, and especially with Annabella.

And yet one reviewer has actually called him "a victim of foolish people rather than a sinister corrupter of innocence"!

Byron might have saved himself from pride and lust by action. It is when in Greece he confronts highfalutin about independence with demands for artillery, gunpowder, and medical stores, that we have a glimpse of what might have been. M. Maurois' summing up seems to be on right lines:

> "Endowed with the gifts for a life of action, having at once courage, realism, and clear-headedness, Byron had been doomed to dreaming by reason of his indecision. He had desired to be at one and the same time a liberal, a defender of the peoples, and a great libertine nobleman,—a husband and a Don Juan,—a Voltairean and a Puritan. He had fought English society, and he had desired its favours. Neither Tory nor Radical, he had been in English politics that most luckless, because most self-divided, of animals—a Whig. He had always been lacking in that unity of thought and conduct which alone fosters great designs."

From Byron it is natural to turn to Lord Melbourne, whose wife was one of the many women whose lives Byron helped to ruin. History has never done justice to Melbourne, whose affectations of indolence and strong language have too easily deceived both contemporaries and historians. Mr. Bertram Newman's readable study aims at giving him his proper place in the story of English politics, and that aim is successfully achieved. Mr. Newman shows us Melbourne as the ideal Prime Minister for a time of constitutional change, conservative by instinct, with his maxim of "when in doubt what to do, do nothing" and yet capable of directing changes demanded by the course of events.

Here is Mr. Newman's summary of his character:

> "But Melbourne had, all his life, been blessed or cursed with a mind that could not rest on the surface of things, and sought restlessly for those settled convictions which it never appears to have found. A sensitive nature clothing itself with a protective garment of flippancy, a vigorous intellect allied with an indolent and sensuous disposition, a vein of melancholy relieved by displays of high animal spirits—these things may not be uncommon in themselves. More uncommon, probably, is the combination, such as he displayed, of a highly critical and detached intellect with a rough and ready shrewdness, an almost rustic bluntness of speech, that helped to render him the least 'superior' of men. In any case, it is a question of degree; Melbourne's was a big temperament, and its contrasting elements were accordingly accentuated."

Especially valuable are the chapters dealing with the Prime Minister's relation with the young Queen, whose qualities he quickly discerned, toiling " morning, noon and night " to keep her in the straight constitutional path. Worthy of note is his judgment that " the man who aspired to be the husband of the Queen of England would need a combination of virtues seldom granted to anyone here below " !

It looks as if the Froude-Carlyle controversy is going to be another " Hundred Years' War ". No sooner do we begin to think the combatants will cease fighting, if only from exhaustion, than another campaign begins. Prof. Waldo H. Dunn's volume is not merely the study of the controversy it claims to be : it is definitely a defence of Froude, Prof. Dunn having no doubt at all, after having examined the evidence, about his judgment, which he states thus :

> " Ruskin expresses the matter admirably when he says that ' it is perfectly possible to protect oneself against small errors, and yet to make great and final error in the sum of work : on the other hand, it is equally possible to fall into many small errors, and yet be right in tendency all the while, and entirely right in the end '. That is the final word. Froude is right in tendency all the while, and entirely right in the end ".

Prof. Dunn has done useful service in summarizing the controversy and letting readers see the parts played in it by the protagonists, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Carlyle, C. E. Norton, and Mr. D. A. Wilson on the one side, and the supporters of Froude on the other. Eighty pages are devoted to " Illustrative Documents ", beginning with Carlyle's will and codicil.

We shall, we expect, now have another spate of books and newspaper correspondence. But when it is all over, will not Carlyle deliver the final verdict on himself :

> " And yet I am a perverse mortal to deal with, and the best resolutions make shipwreck in the sea of practice " ?

Mrs. Hardy's second volume deals with her husband's life from 1892. When his career as a novelist ended (practically with the publication of *Jude the Obscure* in 1895) Hardy apparently ceased to make notes and observations to the extent to which he had done previously, and Mrs. Hardy had therefore much less material on which to draw. As one reads one cannot help being struck, first, by the insistence with which Hardy declares he was a poet who had merely turned aside to novel writing for a time, and second, by his sensitiveness to criticism, both in regard to the moral tendencies of his teaching and in regard to his general philosophy.

Mrs. Hardy's picture of Hardy's old age is not without its attractiveness—many who have a more definite faith than his could learn much from the way he faced advancing years.

There are, of course, many significant and suggestive passages, this, *e.g.* :

> If all hearts were open and all desires known—as they would be if people showed their souls—how many gapings, sighings, clenched fists, knotted brows, broad grins, and red eyes should we see in the market place ".

His judgment on life is summed up on p. 213 :

> Though my life . . covers a period of more material advance in the world than any of the same length can have done in other countries, I do not find that real civilization has advanced equally. People are not more humane, so far as I can see, than they were in the year of my birth. Disinterested kindness is less. The spontaneous goodwill that used to characterize manual workers seems to have departed ".

This volume brings out well Hardy's love of music, of church buildings and of animals, and many will appreciate it as much for these as for the glimpses of famous men its pages give.

Mary Gladstone's diaries and letters make a very quotable book, though it is not easy to master all the Christian names and initials used even with Mrs. Masterman's help. Beginning in 1858, when Mary was 11, the diaries were continued with more or less continuity and assiduity until 1924 (she died in 1927). While the diaries are most valuable in the days when Mary was assisting her father, younger folks will turn with keen interest to the War and post-War entries:

> 18 July to 23, 1914. Went on to Downing St. . . . The P.M. looked so well I cd. not help saying " I don't believe you have a care on earth " " P'raps just one or two ". Margot a little wraith. . . .
>
> July 28, 1914. Could not help saying to the P.M. " If ever a war takes place in the world again, I hope it will be now ". He turned on me with a look of understanding and mischief. " Why ? " " To settle Ireland ". He said, " You're as bad as Winston; who last night, seeing there was more hopeful news, said, ' I'm afraid we shall have a bloody peace ' ".
>
> 8 Sep. 1914. I was at Downing Street to-day and Ld. K. of K. walked in to luncheon—such a pick-me-up. For Margot was in utter despair blacker than anyone I have set eyes on, looking upon the whole thing as a desperate fiasco, and all the fault of French mistakes and French generalship. It was the greatest comfort to have Lord Kitchener's stolid cheerfulness and robust common sense. He did get over there last week and has tried to keep it secret. He approves of all Joffre has done and thinks everything looking better.
>
> Nov. 21, 1918. I suggested to Mr. A(squith) joining the Labour Party. He said it was a temptation—if he was young, wd. try and unite them. The Facing-All-Ways Coalition is a cheat and a sham. . . .
>
> April 3, '24 How foolish it is of the world all to rave of *St. Joan,* for lack of someone speaking the truth. When Watts painted Papa, because he was Watts everyone raved, till I went to see it in Christ Church Hall at Oxford, and said at once, " It's awful ". Then the Dean echoed me and one by one all that saw it took up the same tune, and the picture was returned to Watts, who quite agreed and destroyed it! Someone should show up Bernard Shaw.

The main impressions that come from reading the diaries and letters of the years between 1870 and 1900 are of the personality of the G.O.M. and of the immense part played by " Society " in political life. It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the transformation that has taken place in this respect since Gladstone's death.

Many of the greatest figures in the literary, musical, and artistic world flit across the pages—Browning, Tennyson, Acton, Ellen Terry, Joachim. Mrs. Drew had strong likes and dislikes, and these spice her diaries. Mrs. Masterman has done the editorial work well, though we don't think she has quite forgiven Mrs. Drew for describing her as " rather a minx, with forward priggy manners."

Miss Veronica Lucas's selection from George Sand's letters gives quite an adequate picture of one of the most remarkable women of her time. George Sand " worked like a nigger " all her days. Year after year until her death her pen flowed over the paper, the money she earned thereby serving to keep her husband, her numerous lovers, her children and children's children, and many others. One might think her views erroneous and her morals dangerous, but one cannot but admire her pluck and enterprise. She made large demands on life, saying that her nature was

a happy and forgiving one. Only I do require air, space, absence of contradiction, fair treatment, peace of mind, confidence and freedom of action.

But she was under no misapprehensions about her work. To Flaubert, a frequent correspondent, she wrote :

> My ambition never did leap as high as yours. You want to write for all time; while I believe that in fifty years' time I shall be absolutely forgotten and perhaps cruelly misunderstood.

The letters written to many of the leading literary figures in France over a long period are very quotable, and not least so those about the Franco-Prussian War. Choosing between an appreciation of the Unitarian Channing and a reference to the Englishman, we cite the following :—

> In fact she is a thorough Englishwoman, a prude without modesty; and she is also a thorough Englishman, for a type of mind has no sex and every Englishman thinks himself the finest unit of the finest nation in the world.

The translation reads very well, but the notes are not equally satisfactory, the editor being extremely sparing in information; and there are misprints on pages 82, 95, 183, 213, 221, 260.

The bibliography of Lincoln grows from year to year; it is now probably far longer than that of any other American, Washington included. The latest recruit to the ranks of his biographers is Herr Emil Ludwig, who says he has long been fascinated by Lincoln, whom he thinks of as " like one of Shakespeare's characters, absolutely original, comparable to none, immemorably unique ". Herr Ludwig's sympathy with his subject is obvious from the first page to the last, and one feels, despite the lack of perspective inevitable in his method, that there is less heightening of colour here than in his previous biographies. As before, the book is very readable—a tribute to the translators, Eden and Cedar Paul, as well as to the author. There are misprints on pp. 176 and 181, and the estimate of the cost of the war on p. 500 seems to have gone woefully astray.

A Yorkshireman hailing from Mr. Ben Turner's part of the world naturally approached the late Minister of Mines's autobiography with considerable sympathy. And in it we have certainly found some delightful things : the naïveté which sometimes delights the House of Commons, as when Mr. Turner says, " There's nowt in t'amendment ", frequently appears in the account of his youth and of his work as Trade Union Secretary and political organizer. The book need not have lost its freshness, and it would greatly have benefited, had Mr. Turner asked some kind friend to revise his manuscript. Then we might have escaped such things as, " For as old Timothy says in the New Testament, ' We brought nothing into this world. . . ' "; and the statements that Mr. Turner saw " the Capitol *or* White House " in Washington (p.199) or went to Baltimore to see Niagara ! " The Christian Students' Movement " might also have been given its correct name and some errors of date and some misprints (pp. 286, 333, 353) avoided.

Mr. Turner has a great admiration for the Archbishop of Canterbury : he regretted not being able to attend the enthronement, for he was " in the printed list of those allocated a seat—the only untitled man in the section. . . . " This is but one of many examples of Mr. Turner's childlike pleasure in being somebody : we hear about what he said to the King, and about his going " to a tea party in the Palace ".

The Prime Minister writes a Foreword in which he emphasizes the signs of social progress to be observed in the autobiography. There are signs of other things, too : Mr. Turner may have dreamed of becoming

"T' Mayor o' Batla' ", but he never thought of being one of H.M Ministers: that he is so is a significant portent.

The translation of Herr Fülöp-Miller's *Lenin and Gandhi* i very serviceable, though it seems strangely out of date to read that Mr Gandhi's movement is at present in the background! The author con trasts the methods by which the two men have endeavoured to lea humanity:

> Lenin regarded the unlimited—though only temporary—use of violenc as the means for bringing about an ideal world order, whereas Gandhi i trying to reach the goal by an absolute rejection of all violence. Lenin trie to free humanity by complete mechanisation, Gandhi, by repudiatin machinery in principle. The one regarded machinery as the salvation fro all evil, the other as a delusion of the devil.

Gandhi's belief in *ahimsa,* the love of all created things, is cleverly ex pounded as positive in its aim, and not merely non-resistance. His lif and work are described, and the important correspondence with Tolsto given, as well as some letters written from prison in 1922-3.

English readers acquainted with *Young India* or recent biographies wi find little that is new in the Gandhi section, but they will be grateful fo the sketch of Lenin and the selections from his correspondence. It i clear that Lenin's mind was inflamed with hate by his brother's execution Zinoviev said his face was changed by it, the "deep, unquenchabl hate" being obvious at the first glance: favourite words were thos uttered on the eve of the October Revolution:

> Kind words are no praise for us,
> The hate-laden cry of rage is our only delight.

Believing that "freedom is a bourgeois prejudice", he went relen lessly on, waging war against all supporters of compromise, saying,

> I recognise only one form of conciliation with regard to politica opponents, *écraser*—smash them! . . . . How can you carry out a re volution without executions?

In view of the present Soviet attitude to religious worship, it is in teresting to note that Lenin called God "the arch-enemy of the Com munist social order," and wrote,

> Just because every religious idea, every idea of any God, nay, a coquetting with such thoughts, is an unutterable baseness, it is glad suffered, often welcomed even, by the democratic bourgeoisie, merely be cause it is the most dangerous baseness, the most vile infection.

We found the long extracts from the writings of Lenin's wife difficu to follow: two statements on pp. 74-5, *e.g.,* are in flat contradiction.

EDITOR.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. By R. H CHARLES, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D. Clarendon Press. 30s.

This long-expected work will be welcomed all the more eagerly at las because it is the fruit, and in a sense the crown, of so many years spent b the author in a patient detailed study of the whole immense mass o apocalyptic literature which has come down to us. Archdeacon Charle is not only our foremost but almost our only competent British scholar i this field. He has given us here a complete re-translation of the tex which includes several very attractive adjustments and alteration suggested by an exhaustive study of the versions. As was to be expected his main position regarding the venue and origin of the book does no

differ markedly from that which since Driver's time has been accepted as the view of what may be called orthodox criticism—that the book originated during Antiochus IV's persecution of the *hasīdīm* between 168-165 B.C. The historical part of the introduction is perhaps not so full or stimulating as one who was more of a historian, and less of a textual and apocalyptic authority, might have made it. There are very important and useful studies of the various Greek versions and a full display of the available evidence concerning the Aramaic linguistic problem. Students will probably be less convinced than will the non-Hebraist by Dr. Charles's argument for a plurality of hands in the Hebrew portions of our present canonical text. My own feeling is that he is inclined also to do less than justice to the importance of apocalyptic elements in previous centuries in both Babylonian and Egyptian religious literature, as also to the very large influence of these literatures on the later parts of the *O.T.* in general. The evidence for this, as students of hieroglyphic, and particularly of the later hieratic and demotic, are aware, is constantly accumulating. There is also the immense influence of Hellenism to be considered. The considerations advanced by such authors as Bousset and Wendland seem to have more weight here than many English scholars are willing to concede. Wendland, for example, rightly remarks: "The propaganda in connection with the faiths of inner Asia, which were making such energetic and effective progress in Syria from the year 200 onwards, and inducing such a process of fermentation there, and which were so mixed up with the Greek speculations, had by no means left Judaism untouched". Recent work on the continent all goes to confirm this dictum.

To praise Dr. Charles's scholarship would obviously be an impertinence at this time of day and in this country. We may congratulate ourselves on now possessing two excellent commentaries on *Daniel* in this book and Montgomery's *I.C.C.* volume, typical examples respectively of the best English and the best American erudition and research. Dr. Charles is more forthright and direct than Prof. Montgomery, who showed perhaps a trifle too much deference to the supporters of the traditional view of *Daniel*. The two works supplement each other in some ways.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos. By R. S. Cripps, M.A., B.D. S.P.C.K. 15s.

Mr. Cripps has put an immense amount of labour into this book. His position is that of moderate criticism rather than that of the Cambridge school as we know it to-day in the work of Dr. S. A. Cook and Prof. Kennett. Thus he tends to reject the views of Gressmann and the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* regarding Egyptian influence on the preconditions of the *milieu* in which we find Hebrew prophecy arising. We should also be inclined to lay much more stress on the nationalist and revolutionary aspects of the phenomenon called Hebrew prophecy than does Mr. Cripps. It is rather a pity that the large commentary on this prophet by Prof. Arthur Weiser of Heidelberg did not appear soon enough to be used by the author. In this latter work a great deal of importance is attached to the theology of Amos and correspondingly less emphasis is laid on his ethical teaching. It is an original book, and the almost simultaneous appearance of two large new commentaries on this prophet by younger scholars in England and Germany is perhaps an encouraging sign for those who love the *O.T.*

J. P. Naish.

Christology and Criticism. By B. B. Warfield, D.D. Oxford Press. 15s

This is the third volume of the posthumous publication of the collected works of the great Fundamentalist American scholar who was Professor of Dialectic and Polemic Theology at Princeton. It contains a number of essays, all concerned with the subjects named in its title.

The criticism to be passed upon Dr. Warfield's work can best be put in the form of a reference to Porson's famous epigram on Hermann, the greatest of contemporary German Graecists.

> The Germans in Greek
> Are sadly to seek,
> All save only Hermann
> And Hermann's a German.

Professor Warfield is the prince of Fundamentalists, but he is a Fundamentalist. He was a very great and finished scholar and his scholarship was in a sense entirely up-to-date. He knew accurately all the theories of his modernist opponents, and he had quite an uncanny gift for detecting their weak places. But he is altogether unconscious himself of having any weaknesses in his own theories. He does not remember that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Here in this Christological volume he assumes the two-nature doctrine of Chalcedon to express the plain sense of the New Testament and also to afford a perfectly satisfactory and inexpungable position to those who maintain it. From this position he surveys the theological landscape and deals out praise or blame exactly in proportion to nearness to it or distance from it. When a scholar like Sellin teaches that the Old Testament Messiah is a saving manifestation of God Himself, he is warmly congratulated. But the same Sellin suggests that the Messianic figure owes its origin to the Paradisiacal man who was made in the image of God, and he is reproved for defective Christology.

The doctrine of Chalcedon is made into a bed of Procrustes, where both what exceeds and what falls short are found equally wrong. The moderns are allowed to know nothing at all, if they deviate from this rule. Scholarship has made no advances in the understanding of the New Testament, where Christology is in question. Dr. Warfield can see no difference at all between *Mark's* version of the answer to the young ruler "Why callest thou me good?", and that of *Matthew*, "Why askest thou me concerning what is good?". He is sure that *Rom.* 9[5] ascribes absolute Deity to Christ, although Dr. Denney can write on the same verse :—

"If we ask ourselves point blank, whether Paul, as we know his mind from his epistles, would express his sense of Christ's greatness by calling Him God blessed for ever, it seems to me almost impossible to answer in the affirmative."

The fact is that Dr. Warfield knew Paul's mind not so much from his epistles as by studying the Creed of Chalcedon. His obsession with the fifth century prevents his doing justice either to the first century or the twentieth.

Robert S. Franks.

Five Types of Ethical Theory. By C. D. Broad, Litt.D. Kegan Paul 12s. 6d.

The five types of ethics examined in Dr. Broad's new book are those of Spinoza, Butler, Hume, Kant, and Sidgwick. All are thinkers of the highest rank, and between them they give a very fair idea of the range o

possible views on the subject. Dr. Broad's study of them is avowedly neither historical nor philological, but is to find out what is true and what is false about ethics. The book is apparently preparatory to a treatise on ethics by the author himself. He writes :—

> It appears to me that the best preparation for original work on any philosophical problem is to study the solutions which have been proposed for it by men of genius whose views differ from each other as much as possible.

Meanwhile, we have a critical examination of the above-named types of ethical theory which is of very great value, and which furnishes what is probably now the best introduction to the subject of ethics for the English student. Those who follow Dr. Broad's guidance must be prepared to think hard and closely. He wastes no words. There is a lucid exposition of the doctrine of each thinker, in which his positions are most carefully analysed. They are then submitted to the closest scrutiny both as regards internal consistency and as regards their agreement with experience. All this is most useful and most valuable.

The strictly scientific character of Dr. Broad's work does not obscure his personal equation. One of the interesting features of his book lies in the clear expression of his feelings with regard to certain great names of the past. After praising Sidgwick's *Methods of Ethics* by calling it " on the whole the best treatise on moral theory that has ever been written", Dr. Broad admits that its author has less influence at present "than many writers, such as Bradley, who were as superior to him in literary style as he was to them in ethical and philosophical acumen". T. H. Green is dismissed as "a thoroughly second-rate thinker", who diffused "a grateful and comforting aroma of ethical 'uplift' ".

The book ends with a most exact and acute analysis of the fundamental problems of ethics, followed by a concise dogmatic statement of the author's own views—a statement which, in view of the suggestion made at the outset of his work, we may no doubt conclude he thinks of justifying some day by an independent treatise.

Dr. Broad leans to the view that the fundamental ethical concepts are *a priori* in nature, though derived from experience. But he thinks that while "right" and "ought" are without doubt purely ethical concepts, it is not absolutely certain that "good" is such. The point on which he ends is a protest against over-simplification in the sphere of ethics. It is absolutely impossible to bring all the self-evident principles of ethics under any one supreme principle.

This is a sound and valuable doctrine with an application beyond the sphere of ethics. All philosophy aims at system, but short cuts to system invariably come to grief. It is better to bear the reproach of eclecticism than to take up with a cheap and easy solution of philosophical problems that ignores their complexity. It is satisfactory to have a thinker of Dr. Broad's eminence helping to make this clear.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Evolution of Truth and other Essays. By HOWARD V. KNOX, M.A. Constable. 10s. 6d.

Captain Knox has republished in this collected form a series of essays originally contributed to different journals. From *Mind* come "Green's Refutation of Empiricism" (1900), "Mr. Bradley's Absolute Criterion" (1905), *"What is Pragmatism?* By J. B. Pratt—A Review" (1909), "The Philosophy of William James" (1913), and "Has Green answered Locke?"

(1914). From the *Hibbert Journal* there are "The Letters of William James" (1921), and "Is Determinism Rational?" (1922). Finally, from the *Quarterly Review* we have the essay which gives its name to the book —"Pragmatism. The Evolution of Truth" (1909).

The dates of the papers are important. They show that the greater part of the book belongs to a controversy which, in its original form, may be regarded as gone by. Says a leading modern American philosopher, J. E. Boodin :—

> Pragmatism is now dead, and it is not seemly to speak ill of the dead. No one seems to want to own it now, except writers of French doctors' theses. Schiller is a " humanist " and Dewey a " naturalistic empiricist.' William James exists in glory in spite of pragmatism.

Captain Knox, however, is not ashamed of pragmatism — he is an Abdiel, "faithful found among the faithless". Those who want to know the strength of pragmatism can well learn it by a study of his essays; though to realize its weakness they will have to supplement their reading by going back to the contemporary numbers of *Mind* and studying the other side of the controversy. There is no doubt that the dialectic of *The Evolution of Truth* is brilliant. Yet, as Dr. Broad reminds us in his new book on Ethics, in the main it is true : *Non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum.* Dialectic can be very one-sided. A successful philosophy must be synthetic and not simply argumentative, but Captain Knox is so busy refuting his opponents that he forgets to enquire whether after all there is not some truth in their case that escapes his notice.

A word must be added on the last essay, which is also the most recent and which deals not with pragmatism, but with the related subject of indeterminism. There is much in it that is valuable, and it will repay close study.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Philosophical Theology. By F. R. TENNANT, D.D. Volume II : **The World, the Soul, and God.** Cambridge Press. 15s.

This concluding instalment of Dr. Tennant's great undertaking breaks fresh ground. While in Vol. I we were encouraged to recognize objective certainty in our immediate knowledge of the soul or self, here—relying on what we know of the physical world—we are encouraged to draw the probable inference (p. 79; from "the conspiration of innumerable causes to produce, by their united and reciprocal action, and to maintain, a general order of nature") that there stands behind Nature a rational Being who may not unfittingly be called God. He is not indeed in any proper sense Infinite; that term, we learn, ought to be confined to mathematics. But He is—apparently—possessed of moral perfection; though how such an affirmation can securely be made in a universe where it is probable that "progress" is the one unshakeable value (see Vol. I, p. 154) does not clearly appear. Ours is to be strictly an "empirically derived theism" (p. 220), an "empirically established natural theology" (p. 225). So also (p. 245) we are to substitute a (scientific? and inferential?) "philosophical theology" for any "philosophy of religion" which aspires to "non-reasonable, grounded conviction". Well; one of the most widespread and most impressive of facts, psychological or historical, has been mankind's age-long search after God. Does that fact tell the philosopher—nothing? It is true that we need all the help we can get. Probably St. Paul and (following him) St. Thomas Aquinas were right in seeking to rise from

nature to nature's God; probably Ritschl and Herrmann were far too impatient in leaping to the conclusion that physical nature has nothing to tell us regarding its Maker. But has religion itself nothing to tell us? Or is God revealed everywhere except only in the religious experience—in the tireless search for light from within the veil, in the rapture of attained communion with a heavenly Father? A certain type of empiricist philosophy always reminds one of some poor people at Ephesus long ago, who—in the admirably pointed language of the Authorized Version—"had not so much as heard that there was any Holy Ghost".

Dr. Tennant appeals, as masters of an "empirical, inductive, and explanatory method" (p. 247), to "Locke and Butler, Lotze and Ward". In Locke's case, apart from certain illogical remainders of the moral *a priori* in his Whig doctrine of Law of Nature, we seem already in full career towards a remorseless all-round scepticism. For, if Locke begat Berkeley, Berkeley in turn begat Hume; and each heredity was legitimate enough. As to Butler; with the possible exception of Kant, Butler is the most impressive of all champions of the moral *a priori;* the very prophet of the conscience; and, as such, a matchless treasure. Elsewhere, however, Butler reveals not a little of the weakness of the empiricist mind. "Ten thousand thousand instances of design" are to settle out of hand the problem of Theism; and, when the great moralist turns to speak regarding what has been well termed "the Heart of the Gospel", we find him hanging on for bare life, hanging on like grim death, to the fact of an unexplained and inexplicable atoning sacrifice. Butler is always a noble figure; but here, at what ought to be the supreme moment, he is pathetically unhelpful and well-nigh hopeless.

As to Lotze; the present reviewer has long felt that Lotze is at most points our best guide regarding those border-line questions which are the common concern of philosophy and of Christian theology. It is interesting to recognize a familiar Leitmotif upon p. 74 of this volume. But who can believe that Lotze would accept the staggering paraphrase which immediately follows? "Somewhat of scientific knowledge happens"—*happens!*—"to be possible". Again (p. 82) "The world happens to be a cosmos, when conceivably it might have been a self-subsistent and determinate 'chaos' ". More startling language still occurs on p. 112; "If . . . evolution is to be explained, or to be assigned a sufficient ground, instead of being merely accepted as a brute happening . . . ". It is well that any one feature of our strange universe should receive somewhat more respectful treatment; but is human knowledge then, or is the regularity in nature which makes knowledge possible, a *merely* "brute" happening? There is a warp of idealism as well as a woof of realism in Lotze's philosophy which carries it miles away from Dr. Tennant's narrowly polemical empiricism. In Christian theology, on the other hand, Lotze helps us very little. The despised Ritschl (*cf.* p. 251) helps us much more. Ritschl never tires of quoting the immortal words, "None knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him". The same great truth underlies Denney's watch-word from *I Peter*: we "by Christ do believe in God". Is that supreme ground for faith forbidden by a "philosophical theology"? The case is not perfectly clear. Certain cautions seem to be hinted (pp. 238-9) in favour of a " dogmatic theology" which apparently, unlike the *philosophy* that studies sacred things, may deal in "truths above reason". It is hard, however, to think that this is quite seriously meant. Dr. Tennant seems to regard many of the central positions of traditional theology as vetoed for the philosopher by ethical as well as by rational considerations.

Can Christian theology ignore the Reason? And can it ever possibly dissolve partnership with the Conscience? Anyhow, so far as the present writer can judge, there is no door of escape through the Thomist hypothesis of inscrutable "Mysteries". These may stand for affirmations which are vital to the religious mind; but, in the form which tradition has imposed on them, they have been shrivelled into a *caput mortuum*. We "know Him whom we have believed".

James Ward's *Psychology* was greatly relied on in Vol. I; in this present volume another Cambridge writer is appealed to, and very high praise is offered to Dr. Oman's *Grace and Personality*. Principal Oman is a writer almost as obscure as he is powerful; but in his case there seems little doubt that he is truly concerned to champion not merely man's free personality but also God's saving grace. The case is much less clear in regard to Dr. Tennant. It might be more complimentary than accurate, it might indeed be flattery, to call the theological or religious attitude which emerges from this volume *Semi*-Pelagian.

No mention has been made, so far, of Dr. Tennant's extraordinarily easy-minded Theodicy. Here he does perhaps move along the lines of Butler—admiring "general laws of wisdom" and surmising that "interpositions" would inevitably do more harm than good. The present reviewer has been in the habit of telling a class in Philosophy of Religion that Dr. Tennant's books on sin viewed evil as a—negligible—by-product. The present treatise hardly seems to make evil so much even as that. It is rather an integral part in the whole of things; and how good that whole is, or may be! One might have thought that the issue of any daily newspaper contained enough records, both of sin and of suffering, to make the problem horribly actual. Is there wisdom, or is there pedantry, in the logic that brushes our doubts aside and closes the problem down? Lotze's startling admission, that there is *no* (philosophical) answer to the riddle, comes with a touch of reality—comes like a breath of fresh air. If there is any answer at all to our ultimate doubts, do we not find it when we read, "Nay! In all these things we are more than conquerors, through Him that loved us"? Or, when we turn to what is verily a darker mystery still than even heart-breaking sorrow, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that, like as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life: by Jesus Christ our Lord". Truly, not everything is clear, even to the friends of Christ; but are not such assurances the very light of this dark world—the very light of life?

If we may persist in a search for deeper reconciling truths, undeterred by what we used to call, some fifty years ago, "the 'either-or' of the ordinary consciousness"; if we may hold that Dr. Tennant is right in most of what he asserts, and wrong in regard to a great many things which he denies or omits or ignores; if we may establish the truth that revelation does not issue in "revealed religion", still less in revealed *doctrines*, but means God's manifestation of HIMSELF as our Father and our friend; a revelation which came to Israel through Moses and the prophets, but came to the whole world in Christ the crucified, whom Paul preached; if we may insist upon an honest and candid but also upon an adequate spiritual philosophy, including rational and *a priori* as well as phenomenal and empiricist elements; above all if, while prizing whatever philosophy and psychology have to teach us, we yet keep clearly in view that the gospel of the Lord Jesus belongs to a higher plane both of certainty and of preciousness—then the present gale will blow over, and the ship of faith will ride out the storm.

But Dr. Tennant's volume certainly cannot be neglected. It must be studied, and tested, up to the very last syllable. It contains a vigorous, one might well say a powerful, statement of some profoundly disquieting positions.

There appears to be a superfluous comma, barricading the path between subject and predicate, upon l. 10 of p. 65.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

The Mind of the School Child. By VALENTINE DAVIS. Cartwright & Rattray. 7s. 6d.

The Child from Five to Ten. By EVELYN and MIRIAM KENWRICK. Kegan Paul. 7s. 6d.

The Lobster from Sea to Mayonnaise or *The Stomach of the Infant Octopus* are titles which would imply a delicacy of abstraction both scientific and unexceptionable, but "the child"—who ever came near to encountering that *monstrum?* Fortunately the authors of the two excellent books under review show no traces of the illusion which their titles gloomily suggest.

Mr. Davis's purpose is to give young teachers an introduction to psychology which will be really useful to them in the practice of their art of teaching. These—and not the young ones only—have cause to be grateful to him, for he offers them at a praiseworthy price a book which is packed with theoretical psychology, and yet at no point ceases to be practical and stimulating or to reflect the mind of one whose wide experience has given him a breadth of outlook which has by no means diminished his enthusiasm. The references to the technical literature are admirable and catholic, and the student will be at no loss where to turn in the pursuit of his subject. It will, however, be long before he has exhausted the material provided by Mr. Davis or has tested all the practical experiments suggested to him. The printing and set-out of the chapters is done in a manner presumably intended to aid the digestion, and that perhaps it does, but the continual jumps from fount to fount are, we feel, somewhat detrimental to the nervous system. The author is, however, so genial and friendly that our irritation is unable to exceed bounds.

The Misses Kenwrick have reprinted in book form articles contributed to *Good Housekeeping* during the years 1925-27. Thanks are due to the readers of those articles who persuaded them to this action, and to the authors for being prevailed upon, for parents with young children can hardly read this book without profit. There is knowledge here, and wisdom, sympathy, and sense too, and those who look to the Misses Kenwrick for guidance are not likely to be led into methods which illustrate either the sad errors of the past or the obsessive follies of the present. As we read of Mary and Jim and many others we were reminded of William Law with his Miranda and Eusebia and the like. It is true the contrasts are (mercifully) greater than the similarities—but Law drew with consummate skill from life, and therein lies the compliment.

Both books are dedicated to the children: Mr. Davis's to "all school children" in the hope that his book may help their teachers to give them "many happy days", and the Misses Kenwrick's to "all the children (not forgetting Joyce)" who have contributed to their happiness and knowledge —the children (bless them), not "the child".

E. R. MICKLEM.

The Psychology of Religious Adjustment. By EDMUND S. CONKLIN. Macmillan. 8s. 6d.

It is usual for the psychologist who writes on religion to disclaim any desire to trespass on the field of the theologian; but few, so far, have been able to resist the temptation. The necessary result has been that we have been treated with a description of the religious consciousness, and with more or less faulty theological inferences, coloured by religious prejudice. Professor Conklin—already well-known for his work on *Abnormal Psychology*—is among the few; and the volume under review is an example of a cautious analysis and description of "religious habits, thoughts, feelings, emotions and attitudes with their conscious accompaniments". It is a volume I would recommend to every minister who wants to see the pure psychology of the matter and who desires to be left to draw his own theological and philosophical inferences. Dr. Conklin roots religion in the three fundamental drives of human nature—power, physical reproduction, and the "equally urgent drive for food, for comforts, for luxuries, for knowledge, for peaceful living with all the powers of nature and with supernatural powers". All these drives are found in the motivation of religion. With fine discrimination he discusses religion as emotion, attitude, and belief, and argues that "A psychological definition of religion must include both the experiential and the institutional". His own definition is: "Religion may be defined as designating that behaviour and those behaviour products which are associated with a belief attitude toward some concept of god or gods". The concept of God he believes to be essential to religious experience. To be stable, religion must become a sentiment, and he gives a useful comparison between the religious sentiment and the love sentiment. He is able to show that, although the belief content may change and the feeling and active elements ebb and flow, the sentiment may remain and be continually re-aroused. He is quite clear that the religious sentiment cannot be void of a theological content; and whatever changes of theology there may be there is always a fundamental truth left. It is on the practical side that the working minister will find him very helpful. Nothing seems to have been overlooked. There are illuminating chapters on "Religious Appeals", "The Order of Worship", "Retreat and Evangelism", "Childhood Backgrounds", and "Religious Education". A chapter on "Faith and Faith-Healing" is extremely valuable and worth the price of the book. The volume strikes me as a very fresh approach to the whole subject.

JOHN G. MCKENZIE.

Social Psychology. By BERNARD C. EWER. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

There is no branch of psychology so wide as that designated "Social" it seems to overlap so many other studies. Our author defines it as "the study of the individual consciousness and behaviour as they relate to other individuals, and also of the behaviour of groups". This follows the line of Prof. McDougall, to whom the author acknowledges his debt. He seems however, to have absorbed more of Prof. McDougall's *Introduction* than of his *Group Mind*. He has incorporated the contributions from psycho-analysis and the purer type of sociology as represented by Dr. Giddings. He refuses to accept the latter's position that the mental basis of society is to be found in "Consciousness of Kind", and enumerates four levels (*moments* would have been the better word) of social consciousness and behaviour: that which is innate; what is learned through accidental experience of pleasure and pain; imitation of others; and reflective thought. Our social motives he finds in our instinctive nature or "drives" and in the

acquired sentiments. All this seems to me to account for the behaviour of the individual in relation to the members of the group and towards the group itself; but it hardly accounts for the group itself with its cohesion, its collective action and to some extent "collective mind". Some principle analogous to Dr. Giddings's *conscious of kind* or the idealist's *general will* has yet to be found before all the facts are accounted for, and I doubt if *imitativeness* on which Mr. Ewer lays such stress is sufficient.

His treatment of imitation is illuminating, but not more so than his study of intuition. That is one of the best sections. After all, it is the *meaning* which the social situation has for the individual which determines his response—a fact which Behaviourism overlooks. The chapters on "Leadership" and "Maladjustment" are of real importance to teachers and social workers; while those dealing with social conflict and social progress form a good introduction to social theory. The teaching of the book may be summarized in a quotation:

> "The common uncritical faith that there is in human affairs, if not a divinely ordered advance, at least an inevitable forward drift, must be replaced by deliberate concentrated effort to bring to pass forms of social welfare which will not otherwise come. The sole pathway of democratic progress is that of an appropriate idealistic and scientific education."

In other words, the Kingdom of God is not inevitable but only possible. Curiously enough, religion and philanthropy, patriotism, nationalism and internationalism are relegated to an appendix. I should have thought that the influence of these on social change would have warranted their discussion as part of the thesis. Is he afraid of the Behaviourists? Altogether the book is to be recommended as a wide introduction to the problems of social psychology. JOHN G. MCKENZIE.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

In *The Christian Content of the Bible* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) Mr. G. H. Gilbert presents "The Bible reduced to the Standard of Jesus". He argues that loyalty to Jesus demands "the Christianizing of the Bible", for, owing to "the fact that the Christian religion was at first held and propagated by Jews, the Church has to-day a standard which is no less Jewish than Christian". "We know the *spirit* of Jesus; we know what great *truths* sustained his soul and guided him in his work; we know what he *wanted* of men": therefore we ought to prepare a Christianized Bible, which will be relatively short and "homogeneous, not a book of various religions". This Bible Mr. Gilbert outlines. First we have the words of Jesus in (1) *Mark*; (2) *Matt.* and *Luke*; (3) *Matt.* only; (4) *Luke* only: then Part II contains "The Old Testament Brought to the Standard in Jesus" (five sections), and Part III "The New Testament Brought to the Standard in Jesus" (four sections).

Dr. Headlam warmly commends *Fact and Faith in the Bible* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), in which one of his clergy, the Rev. W. R. Williams, attempts to bridge the gulf in Biblical knowledge between the pulpit and the pew. The commendation is well deserved: the more work of this kind we have the better.

A new volume in "Every Teacher's Library" (N.S.S.U., 2s. 6d.) is Dr. R. C. Gillie's *The Later Story of the Hebrews,* and in the "Anglican Library of Faith and Thought" (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.) Canon H. L. Goudge's *The Church and The Bible,* a thoughtful attempt to reconcile "Catholic" and "Protestant" views.

Dr. Raymond Calkins, a New England Congregationalist, is the latest commentator on *Jeremiah*. In *Jeremiah the Prophet* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.), "A Study in Personal Religion", he writes with enthusiasm, lamenting the neglect of the prophet. He makes good use of his predecessors, G. A. Smith, Skinner, Kent, and, especially, Peake, his general attitude being acceptance of critical results, with a leaning to the conservative side.

The new volume in the " Speaker's Bible " (Aberdeen, Speaker's Bible Office, 9s. 6d.) is the Minor Prophets. What there is is good, but, apart from the Index, we have only 228 pp. for the twelve books; and some texts which could have been very helpfully treated in the manner of this work are missing.

The " Clarendon Bible " keeps up its standard in the Rev. H. Balmforth's *St. Luke* (Clarendon Press, 4s. 6d.). The Introduction is largely based on the work of Canon Streeter and Dr. Vincent Taylor; the text of the Revised Version is printed; and the notes and commentary are scholarly and useful.

We give to Dr. Nairne's **Every Man's Story of the New Testament* (Mowbray, 6s. and 4s. 6d.) the warm welcome we gave to the corresponding Old Testament volume. The sketch is prodigal of illustrations, and there is a personal, almost an idiosyncratic, note about the text that is very pleasing (as is the unusual dedication—to the publishers !) Dr. Nairne, we note, accepts Dr. Oman's reconstruction of *Rev.* Is it not pedantic to talk about *Mr.* Streeter so carefully, when all other scholars are given their titles?

Dr. Vincent Taylor deserves our thanks for *The Gospels* (Sharp, 2s. 6d.), "A Short Introduction" which summarizes both Canon Streeter's and Dr. Taylor's own conclusions. Ministers and theological students will relish the book, but it is by no means popular enough in style for, say, the average Sunday School teacher.

The Hulsean Lectureship at Cambridge has now been thrown open, and Dr. C. Anderson Scott, the first non-Anglican lecturer, discoursed effectively on *New Testament Ethics* (Cambridge Press, 5s.). His aim was to discover the guiding principles underlying *N.T.* teaching. Naturally he concentrates on Jesus and Paul. In the last lecture, however, he discusses " Limitations and Their Removal", and thus sums up the Christian ethic for to-day :

> Thou shalt not in any wise exploit thy man-servant or thy maid-servant, his time, his talents or his health, but in every thing encourage him to make full use of his opportunities of self-development and self-realisation.
>
> Thou shalt not in any thing cheat thine employer of the service thou hast promised him, or of the energy and intelligence that are needed for the performance of thy work.
>
> Thou shalt not indulge any appetite, however natural, at the cost of injury to the health or character or the dignity of a fellow-creature for whom Christ died.

The title—*The Pathetic Fallacy* (Longmans, 5s.)—of Mr. Llewelyn Powys's " Study of Christianity " suggests the standpoint of its writer.

> Christianity is based on several illusions: the illusion of a beneficent God, the illusion that each individual soul lives after death . . . that Jesus Himself rose from the dead, the illusion that the world is shortly to come to an end. But yet truth remains in it.

In 129 pages Mr. Powys determines the whole matter, showing us as he goes along how clever a person he is and how wonderfully well he can write. Two pages are given to " Christian Conception ", these being

quotations about hell-fire; but there is no mention of Christianity as believed and practised, say, by Free Churchmen to-day—indeed no mention of the Free Churches at all. Of Paul we read :

> There simmer in him, in this inventor of the religion of Europe and both the Americas, all the monomanias that from Abraham to John the Baptist seethe like the milk of so many devil's dams in Jewish veins.

What tosh it is ! But anything for effect ! Thus :

> The core of Protestantism may be found in the *Institutes* of John Calvin. This impressive old rogue—little, lean, and bearded—dug himself in at Geneva.

The first sentence is true enough, but the old rogue was only 26 when he wrote the *Institutes,* and he died before he reached 55. There is a misprint on p. 104.

There are signs that Mr. Powys has brains. May he put them to better use when next he writes.

Dr. C. H. Valentine's *Redigging the Old Wells* (Skeffington, 2s.) contains five " simple lectures on some of the fundamentals of Christian experience, delivered as an experiment in place of the Sermon after Evening Prayer". The topics are faith, renunciation, temptation, grace, and forgiveness.

Did not Voltaire say that for 4,000 years men had discussed immortality in 4,000 ways? How then can anyone say anything fresh and new on the subject? In *If I had only One Sermon to Preach on Immortality* (Allen and Unwin, 7s. 6d.) 23 preachers make a contribution. They include one Jew, one Roman Catholic, four from this country (Miss Royden, Dr. Hutton, Dr. Norwood, and the Rev. Leyton Richards); the rest are American Protestants. The editorial work leaves something to be desired. We do not mind Mr. Leyton Richards being given the doctorate he deserves, but we utterly decline to believe that Dr. Parkes Cadman is only three years older than ourselves !

My Hopes and Fears for the Church (Murray, 7s. 6d.) consists of a series of papers written in view of the approaching Lambeth Conference, and edited by the Dean of Canterbury. The writers are all men of progressive mind who are, in the main, just below episcopal rank : they have a real concern that the Bishops should courageously face the present situation. Mr. Sheppard urges that " for the Church to preach fellowship to the world while it is guilty itself of this sin of separation is an act of hypocrisy ". The Dean of Chester gets to the centre of the re-union problem in what he has to say about baptism, as does Dr. J. K. Mozley when he writes :

> " If we hold that baptism is not a rite to be praeter-mitted according to an individual's private judgment, that a re-united church must be an episcopal church, that some standard of orthodoxy is necessary, and that, unless and until some better standard is found, the Nicene Creed must be taken as that standard, we cannot envisage a scheme of re-union with those who on one or more, and sometimes on all, of those points are in definite disagreement with us."

By the way, we imagine the Halley Stewart Trustees would be glad to learn when and where Mr. Ramsay Muir delivered those " excellent Halley Stewart Lectures " of which the Dean of Manchester speaks.

Dr. F. J. McConnell, who succeeded Dr. Parkes Cadman as President of the Federal Council of Christian Churches in the United States, has the same breadth of outlook and the same sound common sense as his predecessor. He has travelled and read widely, and enforces his arguments

with many illustrations from observation and from books. His **Human Needs and World Christianity* (S.C.M., 5s.) shows how the world over better health, more wealth, sound knowledge, larger freedom, and closer fellowship are needed for clearer vision and effective service. A suggestive study.

Some of Mr. Basil King's books, notably *The Conquest of Fear,* have been commended in these pages, but none of them has been better than **Adventures in Religion* (Indep. Press, 7s. 6d.). A boy of 12 and a girl of 7 begin to ask their parents questions about religion: desiring to give satisfactory answers, the father begins to read and inquire: this book contains the resulting conversations in the family. In very readable fashion it presents a Christian apologetic, and parents and ministers should be grateful for it.

It may safely be said that no book quite like Mr. Roger W. Babson's *Storing Up Triple Reserves* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) has been written before, and also that it could not have been written anywhere but in America. Its sub-title is " Success is Secured by Developing Financial, Physical, and Spiritual Resources", and we are told that "for over 25 years the Babson Statistical Organization has been collecting data on Reserves: Financial Reserves, Physical Reserves, and Intangible Reserves". The conclusions derived from these data are arranged in a scheme of lessons for 3 terms of 13 weeks each. In the first term all kinds of problems relating to money, mainly investments, are considered; in the second, health problems; and in the third, " Intangible Reserves", the problems are very miscellaneous. In one volume you have advice on stocks and shares, physical exercises for every day, counsel about worry, and a strong recommendation to spend ten minutes each day in Bible reading. So overwhelming is the book that it must be read again.

Everything written by Canon E. S. Woods, the new Bishop of Croydon, is attractive, and *A Faith that Works* (S.C.M., 5s.) has the characteristics that have marked previous books. Perhaps it does not go very deep; but if all professing Christians would read and act on it the Church would be much more effective and the world a much better place to live in. Canon Woods is a " populariser " rather than an original thinker, but he makes very good use of the works of others. Some expressions become very familiar as we read: the word "sagely" is a favourite, and the epithet "great" a *great* temptation: we have in the same paragraph "the *great* Lambeth Conference" and "the *great* Conference at Lausanne": there is also the feeling after a re-united Church that shall be a *great* organization: it is just there we have our doubts, being much more inclined to the truth contained in the sentence from Mr. G. K. Chesterton that Canon Woods twice quotes: "If you want to make a thing living, make it local".

As a *vade-mecum* for ordinands Canon Wallis's *Verbi Ministeriun* (Faith Press, 3s.) should be quite useful, but it would be no compliment to Anglican clergy of older growth if it could not be assumed that almost all the book has to say is "milk for babes". Some of it is elementary indeed, as when the man who reads his sermons is told to make sure (1) that he has his sermon with him before he sets out for church; (2) that there is a good light on the desk in the pulpit.

Not the least interesting parts of the book are those in which Canon Wallis draws on his wide historical knowledge, and always his advice is based on sound commonsense. We thought the time had gone, however, when an open-air speaker could be warned to be prepared to deal "with the objections to the Church which may be raised by Roman Catholics and Nonconformists". "To the Church"? What Roman Catholic or Non-

conformist raises an objection to the Church? We suppose that by "the Church" Canon Wallis means that comparatively small proportion of Christendom represented by the Episcopal community in England.

The title of Canon T. W. Pym's *A Parson's Dilemmas* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) is not particularly well chosen, but the book is worth the perusal of all those engaged in the work of the Christian ministry. It contains six lectures delivered at Cambridge, and offers sound advice to those entering the work of the ministry in very difficult days.

Dr. Fort Newton calls *The New Preaching* (S.C.M., 5s.) " A Little Book about a Great Art". He writes in the conviction that " inspired preaching is the greatest power known among men—that of a kindled, consecrated personality. It is more compelling than literature, more intimate than architecture, more vivid than music". There is a chapter on Jesus under the title, "My Master", and an appreciation of Phillips Brooks, but the rest of the book deals with the preacher's task in the new world of to-day. Many preachers will find a hard saying on p. 26, but we believe Dr. Fort Newton has the right of it : "Surely if a preacher cannot remember his sermon long enough to preach it, nobody will remember it long after it is preached". There are misprints on pp. 120, 173, 174. Is there any evidence that Gladstone was wont to worship in S. A. Tipple's church?

In the "Handbooks of Religion" (Eyre & Spottiswoode) we have the Rev. W. L. Knox's *Penitence and Forgiveness* (2s. 6d.) and Dr. W. E. Orchard's admirable sketch, *Prayer* (4s.). Under the same title is Dr. B. M. Allen's translation of Signor Mario Puglisi's larger work (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.), which will be admired for its thoroughness even when its argument cannot be accepted. Signor Puglisi discusses his subject under four heads : "Prolegomena to A Philosophical Interpretation of Prayer "; " Phenomenology of Prayer "; " Meaning and Value of Prayer"; "Prayer in the Religious Life of To-day". The thorough nature of his treatment may be gauged from the fact that the bibliography occupies nearly 40 pp.

Students will find Dr. E. O. James's *The Christian Faith in the Modern World* (Mowbray, 7s. 6d.) of service, if only for the bibliographies attached to each chapter. The book as a whole, too, is useful, though it suffers from attempting to cover too much ground. To discuss the universe and evolution, the Bible and the Church, the ministry and the sacraments, to present an outline of Christian theology and estimate the future of religion, all in 250 pp., is beyond the wit of man !

We like Dr. David Yellowlees's *Psychology's Defence of the Faith* (S.C.M., 5s.), though we think the medical conceit that is conspicuous at times will annoy ministerial and other readers. The book consists of Swanwick Lectures, and we think those who heard them would be instructed and stimulated. Dr. Yellowlees has something to say about psychologists like Freud and Jung, about psycho-analysis and repression, and about the relation of psychology to religious experience. He does not believe in "spiritual healing" (there is a long Appendix on the subject, saying he has examined every case mentioned in an account of Mr. J. M. Hickson's work for five years without finding one which could not be explained by suggestion or else which offered reliable evidence of the existence of the disease, and of its cure). Another interesting aside is :

> There is something to be said for the view that the multiplicity of sects is not altogether a disgrace to Christianity, but quite a strong point in its favour.

Many years ago Mr. Henry Ford sent Mr. Douglas Fairbanks a cop of Mr. R. W. Trine's *In Tune with the Infinite*. Discovering this fact Mr. Trine interviewed Mr. Ford, and their conversations are recorded i *The Power That Wins* (Williams & Norgate, 5s.). We learn that Mr Ford has never known what it is to be discouraged, that he cures cold by fasting for 48 hours, and a host of other things of varying degrees o interest and usefulness.

Mr. J. T. Newton's *Hints to Teachers* (N.S.S.U., 2s.) will be foun helpful in practice by those teachers who find many treatises on psycholog and the art of teaching altogether beyond them.

The Rev. T. L. Harris's *Christian Public Worship* (Williams & Norgate, 6s.) is a serviceable account of the history and development c worship, *plus* 140 pp. of suggestions for services of various kinds. Mr Harris has seen something of Church life both here and in the Unite States, and this lends a welcome freshness and freedom to his views an to his style. All those called to conduct public worship could learn some thing from him: indeed, he has given us the most useful book on th subject since Dr. R. S. Simpson's *Ideas of Corporate Worship*.

Dr. H. T. Hodgkin's *Jesus Among Men* (S.C.M., 4s.) is intended fo family reading. It covers a period of twelve weeks, with passages fro the Gospels and comment thereon for each day. We should be glad t hear from any who use the book in the way intended: anything that help to revive family worship will be a great boon.

Dr. Furse, the Bishop of St. Albans, discovered in conference with 3 Scout-masters that while systematic training was given to them for ever other part of their work, they were left without guidance as to the bes way of helping Scouts to carry out the first part of their promise—the duty towards God. In order to help them Dr. Furse has written *God' Plan* (S.C.M., 4s. and 2s. 6d.).

The Golden Grove (Oxford Press, 10s.) is an entirely admirable selec tion from Jeremy Taylor's sermons and writings. There is a charmin and informing Introduction by Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith, adequate note and a full bibliography by Mr. R. Gathorne-Hardy.

Temple Bells (S.C.M., 5s.) is another valuable selection, made b Dr. A. J. Appasamy from Hindu Religious Literature. In his sho Introduction Dr. Appasamy claims that a sense of loving, joyou "abandon" to God is a mark of much of that literature. 25 pp. are devote to sketches of authors and books, and the translations, in poetry an prose, occupy 120 pp.

The Greek Fathers (Harrap, 5s.) in the "Our Debt to Greece an Rome" series has been entrusted to Prof. J. M. Campbell, of the Catholi University of America. The sketch is slight, but it traces the influen of the Greek Fathers down to the present day.

Most British Christians are conscious of their extreme ignorance abo the history, beliefs, and practice of the Orthodox Church, and they will b grateful to Miss Euphrosyne Kephala for a little volume, *The Church o the Greek People: Past and Present* (Williams & Norgate, 5s.) which ma help them to conceal, if not to remove, that ignorance. Archbisho Germanos contributes a Foreword.

We shall shortly celebrate the 15th centenary of Augustine's deat With that in view Dr. Eleanor McDougall has prepared "a study in h personal religion"—*St. Augustine* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.)—which will be

especial help to those who are disturbed by the lack of chronological sequence in the *Confessions*. Dr. Vernon Bartlet writes a Foreword.

In *A People's Book of the Saints* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) Mr. J. Alick Bouquet tells with piety and enthusiasm the story of some forty of the saints, most of them English saints.

Anything that brings Richard Rolle to the notice he deserves is to be acclaimed, and right glad we are to have Mr. G. C. Heseltine's *Selected Works of Richard Rolle, Hermit* (Longmans, 8s. 6d.). It contains all Rolle's English writings (with the exception of the translation of and commentary on the Psalter) and a translation of *De Emendatione Vitæ*. The Introduction does not win our confidence: there are too many generalizations, and an ignorant belittling of the work of Wyclif.

Prof. Pierre Janelle has put all students of 16th century history in his debt by the research incorporated in *Obedience in Church and State* (Cambridge Press, 15s.). The Introduction and Notes show an intimate and detailed knowledge of the period. The three tracts of Stephen Gardiner here printed—in two cases from manuscript and in the third from the 1536 edition—are the Tract on Fisher's Execution, *The Oration of True Obedience,* and the Answer to Bucer. In each case the Latin is printed on the left page, the English translation opposite.

Mr. J. R. Earle continues his plan of making the writings of Jacob Böhme available to English readers. He has now translated *De Electione Gratiæ* and *Quæstiones Theosophicæ* (Constable, 10s. 6d.) prefixing a translation of Dr. H. A. Fechner's sketch of Böhme's Life. In recent years there has been a revival of interest in Böhme and his writings, for which a great deal of the credit must be given to Mr. Earle.

Father M. V. Ronan has followed up his *Reformation in Dublin, 1536-1558* by *The Reformation in Ireland under Elizabeth, 1558-1580* (Longmans, 21s.). It is encouraging to find Roman Catholic scholars engaged in research work of this kind, and these volumes help to throw light on a country and period of which all too little is known. The bias of the writer is obvious, and can therefore do no harm: it is not blatant, however, and is revealed by what is missing rather than by what is written. Father Ronan, for example, appears to have little acquaintance with the Puritan wing of Protestantism—his references to Thomas Cartwright suggests the opposite of wide knowledge. Nevertheless, no student of Elizabethan ecclesiastical history but will be glad to have these volumes on his shelves.

Two works dealing with one of the most critical episodes in the history of the Roman Church lie before us. Dom Cuthbert Butler's *The Vatican Council* (Longmans, 2 vols., 25s.) is largely based on the letters Archbishop Ullathorne wrote from Rome during the Council, and thus has sometimes almost a journalistic liveliness. Nevertheless, like all Dom Butler's work, it is scholarly and restrained, and it must be read by all who wish to understand the promulgation of the Infallibility Decree. While Dom Butler writes as a loyal Roman Catholic, he frankly criticizes not only the procedure of the Council, but also the Pope himself for not maintaining a position of neutrality. We cannot, however, share his view of the freedom of the Council, for in preference to accepting the testimony of Ollivier, the French Premier, who was not at the Council, we accept the letters so abundantly quoted in this book, which suggest anything but perfect freedom. Ullathorne's letters are complementary to Quirinus and Salmon; and the Appendix, containing the *Constitutio Dogmatica* in Latin and English, is a useful addition. There are misprints on I. 42, and (possibly) II. 153, 244.

The second book is J. B. Bury's *History of the Papacy in the 19th Century (1864-1878)* (Macmillan, 10s.), which deals very fully with the Syllabus, and gives a clear account of the developments during these years. We do not think, however, that the sketch will help Bury's reputation as historian. In the very readable memoir which Dr. R. H. Murray has written John Morley is quoted as saying to Mr. Herbert Fisher, " Bury does not cast his shadow on the page ". Here, as in the little *History of the Freedom of Thought,* the shadow is sometimes very obvious.

In contrast Bury is seen at his best in the *Selected Essays* (Cambridge Press, 12s. 6d.) which Dr. Harold Temperley has edited. Here Bury presents his views of history with force and fairness, while the essays on Byzantine history are marked by accuracy and insight.

Since he left Roman Catholicism Mr. J. W. Poynter has been assiduously setting forth his views of that Church and its teaching, albeit without bitterness, and with wide knowledge. Two of his books are now on our desk. *Inside the Roman Church* (Sharp, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) is a valuable survey, first of the claims and the growth of the Roman Church, and then of its position to-day, especially in this country. The account of the various Catholic Societies and periodicals presents a great deal of information in a very handy way. St. *George* Mivart gets a wrong Christian name on p. 105. *The Reformation, Catholicism, and Freedom* (S.P.C.K., 6s.), to which the Bishop of Gloucester contributes a Preface, covers part of the same ground, but it also describes Roman Catholic and other martyrdoms. Mr. Poynter doubts whether the number of Roman Catholics in England has increased in proportion to the population in the last 80 years.

Happy is the octogenarian who can write with the vigour of the Rev. J. E. Flower, whose *The Priest in the Church* (Clarke, 5s.) comes with ringing echoes of nineteenth century " No Popery " days. There are some to-day who, in the overwhelming desire for union between the Churches, are tempted to minimize vital differences, and Mr. Flower's sketch is therefore salutary, even though it may be felt that his bias is unduly strong.

The courage of a scholar who attempts to write a one-volume *History of the Modern Church from 1500 to the Present Day* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.) enlists our sympathy, and we wish we could say that the Rev. J. W. C. Wand's success has proved equal to his courage. In estimating a work of this kind we first look at the period and the subjects we know best, and then we examine the way the book is proportioned. Mr. Wand does not come through the test well. His account of Elizabethan Puritanism and Nonconformity is amazingly meagre, and in parts it is full of mistakes—the paragraph about the Marprelate Tracts is an example, even if we forgive Mr. Wand for accepting from others adjectives like "virulent" and "venemous". Browne and Barrow are not mentioned; indeed there is little about Congregationalism, though a place is found for Dr. Orchard. Altogether, too, far too much space is given to England.

Protestants will do well to read the "Calvert Series," edited by Mr. Hilaire Belloc (Burns, Oates, 4s. each), three new volumes of which are before us—Mr. R. A. Cram's *The Catholic Church and Art,* Mr. G. N. Shuster's *The Catholic Church and Literature,* and Mr. John O'Grady's *The Catholic Church and the Destitute.*

The R.P.A. owes much to the enthusiasm of Mr. J. M. Robertson—if we are allowed to apply the term "enthusiasm" to "rationalists". Mr. Robertson's *History of Free-thought in the Nineteenth Century* (Watts 2 vols., 25s.) is an expansion of an earlier sketch, and it is safe to say

that as a book of reference it will be in constant use. One need not share Mr. Robertson's opinions—indeed one might refuse to accept his meaning of the term "free-thought"—to recognize the amount of labour put into these volumes and the amount of service they will render. The portraits of leading scientists, Biblical critics, and "free-thinkers" add to the interest. Once more, however, we are struck by the neglect of the Free Churches.

Mr. H. M. Barron's *Your Parish History* (Wells Gardner, 3s. 6d.) tells those desirous of writing the history of their parish how to set about it.

A great deal of work has gone to the making of Mr. Thomas Whitehead's *History of the Dales Congregational Churches* (Keighley : Feather Bros., 5s.) and it is evident that the task has been a labour of love. Mr. Whitehead not only gives a summary of Congregational history in the Dales, but has sections dealing with Academies and Colleges, and the Lord Wharton Charity, as well as a chronological list of all the Congregational Churches in Yorkshire. Then he takes the Dales Churches one by one, giving an account of their history, with lists of ministers, *etc.* The photographs are a feature of a welcome volume, for which Mr. Whitehead deserves the thanks of all Congregationalists.

We always think of Sir James G. Frazer as the finest flower of British culture. He has a special subject, in which he is an authority without peer : from it he wanders out into other spheres of learning, seeming quite at home wherever he goes : in addition to all which he possesses the gift of a style so beautiful that he can describe the most recondite subjects in the most fascinating way. Two volumes before us illustrate the truth of this judgment. In *Myths of the Origin of Fire* (Macmillan, 12s. 6d.) Sir James gathers evidence from fifteen lands of the globe, and shows that there are three successive ages—the Fireless Age, the Age of Fire Used, and the Age of Fire Kindled. *The Growth of Plato's Ideal Theory* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is an Essay written by Sir James more than fifty years ago in competition for a Fellowship at Trinity. Before then he had read all Plato in the original, and he has always retained his affection for him. For these personal reasons as well as for its intrinsic merit the Essay will be widely welcomed.

In the same select group as Sir James Frazer is Prof. Gilbert Murray, who has now placed us further in his debt by his English rhyming verse translation of Aeschylus's *The Suppliant Women* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. and 2s.), to which he prefixes a masterly little Introduction.

It was a happy thought of Mr. Augustine Birrell to make another volume of essays, and our pleasure in reading *Et Cetera* (Chatto & Windus, 7s. 6d.) is not less because an essay—"Dr. Doddridge"—which has already appeared in our pages, is included in the volume. Mr. Birrell tells how at Cambridge sixty years ago he posted a paper on Peacock to the *Temple Bar Magazine,* and heard no more about it. We do not know how Mr. Birrell wrote when he was 20, but we do know that these essays have no less charm and whimsicality than those collected in *Obiter Dicta* many years ago.

Mr. Birrell is always *sui generis*. You never know quite when his quaint and genial humour is going to break out—or in. Thus we read of Wordsworth, "whose Poetry all men will now admit is of occasional magnificence, but whose Prose (when not embedded in his Poetry) is always superbly excellent".

Among the essays are papers on Boswell, Lockhart, Wyclif, Bunyan, Whitefield, and Hawthorne. The volume is a pleasant armchair companion.

You have read much about D. H. Lawrence in the newspapers and have been interested in his obituary notices and desire to know more about him? And you have read of Mr. Stephen Potter's *D. H. Lawrence* (Cape, 5s.) and wonder if it will help you? It depends entirely on what you know of Lawrence and his writings already. If you are more or less familiar with his life story and with the 35 works that make up his bibliography, Mr. Potter should be very useful to you. But if your only acquaintance with Lawrence is casual and by way of newspaper references, this " First Study " (which is first in time and not in the sense of a Primer) will scarcely help you at all. You will not find from it whether Mr. Lawrence had any children, or what happened to his first love when he threw her over, or many other things you might look for. You will find Mr. Potter's analysis of Lawrence's philosophy useful, but you will probably be repelled rather than attracted by the man about whom he writes. Prophecy is dangerous, but we venture the opinion that 50 years hence Lawrence will be a literary curiosity merely, and only with luck a subject for a University thesis, despite all the superlatives which have been lavished upon him.

This verdict remains unchanged after reading the papers collected in *Assorted Articles* (Secker, 6s.). Many of them are occasional and ephemeral, and often show Lawrence in his pose of shocking person. This is not to say that frequently he does not approach problems from a new angle, and start trains of thought that may prove very useful. Will anyone, we wonder, take up the idea of a circulating " pictuary "? Lawrence argues that after our pictures have delighted us for a time we should burn them—just as we throw away roses or cushion covers when they have ceased to please—and replace them by others. And, as many people cannot afford to destroy and buy at this rate, a lending library of modern works of art is called for. Here is a chance for Independent Press, Ltd., to launch out!

Mr. R. Thurston Hopkins's *Rudyard Kipling* (Palmer, 5s.) is a chatty, scrappy, but on the whole welcome, book which he describes as "The Story of a Genius".

Miss Celeste Turner has done a useful piece of work in *Anthony Mundy: An Elizabethan Man of Letters* (California and Cambridge University Presses, 12s. and 9s.). Mundy (adequate reasons are given for the spelling of the name, though we usually have *Munday*) was poet, pageanteer, pamphleteer, "our best plotter", as well as pursuivant. Miss Turner is obviously most interested in his literary career: the secondary nature of her concern with Mundy's religious life and activity is often patent: she quotes at secondhand, for example, MSS. that have been available in print for fifteen years. But the research on the literary side is thoroughly and competently performed, and the book will be welcomed by all students of Elizabethan literature.

Mr. Ford Madox Ford's *The English Novel* (Constable, 5s.) is a peculiar piece of work. Setting out to discuss the novel "from the earliest days to the death of Joseph Conrad", it mixes up with some acute criticism many personal irrelevances—"egotistic excrescences" Mr. Ford calls them—and some poses that are merely silly. All that Flaubert did in bringing into existence "the Novel of Aloofness" may be recognized, but it is utterly absurd to say that *Madame Bovary* is, "the world over", with the *Imitatio* and the *Pilgrim's Progress,* " the most read book in Christendom"—just as it is to say that "from the death of Swift to . . *The Way of All Flesh* there is little to be found in the English novel that is not slightly unworthy of the whole attention of a grown-up man—sa

of a grown-up Frenchman". Mr. Ford believes Marryat to be the greatest English novelist, among other things, and you will have to agree with him "supposing you to be of any at all adult tastes or of a seriousness of approach to literary matters". We trust Mr. Ford's judgment about as much as we admire his style!

Mark Guy Pearse lived to a rare old age, but to the end he retained the spirit of a boy. With voice and pen he served the Kingdom of God in a manner all his own, and there will be many who will read with pleasure the story of his life which his daughter (Mrs. George Unwin) and the Rev. John Telford have written (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). There are some good portraits, and some of Pearse's own sketches.

If all electors, young and old, could be made to pass an examination on Mr. Ramsay Muir's *How Britain is Governed* (Constable, 12s. 6d.) we should be on our way to securing an intelligent electorate. The book is an extremely clear analysis of our present system of government, but it also contains suggestions for the future, suggestions which we feel must be adopted if democracy is to be justified. Mr. Ramsay Muir desires to see Parliament not a *governing,* but a critical, body, exercising "control on behalf of the nation", examining the work of administration and seeing it economically and efficiently done. He describes the three forces in our system entirely unrecognized by the law of the constitution: an able bureaucracy; an all but omniscient Cabinet; a series of highly organized parties which enables the dictatorship of a party Cabinet to be upheld. We should like to discuss at greater length many of Mr. Muir's suggestions, and perhaps especially those relating to the establishment of a Cabinet of ten members and of a system of proportional representation, but here we can only commend a very able book to the consideration of readers.

Prof. H. J. Laski believes that it is "necessary in each age to re-state the case for freedom, if it is to be maintained". It is well that there are those who can re-state it so clearly and so forcibly as he does in *Liberty in the Modern State* (Faber & Faber, 7s. 6d.). That there can be no liberty without democracy, "that an authority born of consent is always definitely superior to an authority born of coercion", "that liberty of thought and association—the two things are inextricably intertwined—is good in itself, and its denial is always a means to the preservation of some special, and, usually, sinister interest which cannot maintain itself in an atmosphere of freedom"—these are Mr. Laski's contentions. A misprint on p. 173 should be corrected.

We imagine that the Duce would dearly like to get hold of Signor Francesco Fausto Nitti once again! *Escape* (Putnam, 10s. 6d.) describes Signor Nitti's arrest; his deportation, without trial, to the Isle of Lipari, where 500 political offenders are watched by 600 Fascists; his life on the island; and finally his escape with two comrades. Signor Nitti's uncle, the ex-Prime Minister of Italy, writes an Introduction to a vivid narrative which should serve as useful anti-Fascist propaganda.

In Defence of Capitalism (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.) is a translation of a new edition of Prof. Adolf Weber's *Ende des Kapitalismus,* published in 1929. Marxian prophecies were wrong; Marxian practice has failed in Russia; capitalist countries have shown "really brilliant progress"; the economic order of Socialism is an impossibility; the only hope of economic progress is to transfer the struggle against poverty from the sphere of political phrases into the atmosphere of sober reality: such is Herr Weber's argument.

Dr. Eden Paul's *Chronos: The Future of the Family* (Kegan Paul, 2s. 6d.) is shorter and less stimulating than most of the volumes in the series in which it appears. Dr. Paul, who calls himself "as irreligious a person as any to be found in a day's journey", in arguing that "the family is disintegrating and dwindling under stress of birth control and the emancipation of women", makes many confident and unqualified assertions, as, for example, that "psycho-analysis has shown" that if children learn "to suppress their passions . . . that way madness lies".

It is scarcely credible that two books written by believers in conception control should produce results so opposite as those of Mrs. L. S. Florence's *Birth Control on Trial* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) and Dr. Marie Stopes's *Preliminary Notes on the Various Technical Aspects of the Control of Conception* (C. B. C. Clinic, 6d.). Mrs. Florence describes the work of the Cambridge Birth Control Clinic, and gives a detailed account of the history of the first 300 patients. She personally followed up the 272 cases in which advice was given, and obtained information from all but 25 of them. Of these 247 there were 75 patients with undesired pregnancies, and 80 others who had abandoned contraceptives.

> It is a significant indication of the limitations imposed by present-day knowledge of contraceptives when 155 people out of 247 are obliged to admit that they found methods of family limitation either so ineffective or so distressing, or so troublesome that they abandoned the attempt to use them.

Mrs. Florence, while believing as firmly as ever in conception control, and denying that contraceptives cause "grave annoyance and neuroses", nevertheless agrees that "all devices are disliked by their users".

In contrast to the marked number of failures recorded in Cambridge, Dr. Marie Stopes claims that of the 10,000 cases at the London clinic only 52 were failures. Detailed reports are given only in 787 cases, however, and altogether the data seem nothing like so thorough and reliable as Mrs. Florence's.

Dr. Stopes's pamphlet contains other matter also, especially very serious figures showing (1) the increased deaths and miscarriages as the number of pregnancies increases; (2) the number of damaged or deformed women—3,164 out of 10,000.

Dr. Stopes's pertinacity is shown by her action in regard to Prof. McIlroy, who declared in Court that she had never known a woman who made use of a certain device. Dr. Stopes afterwards went in disguise to the out-patient department of the Royal Free Hospital and was fitted with a device by Dr. McIlroy herself.

Though the confident generalizations which are frequent in Mr. Kenneth Ingram's *The Modern Attitude to the Sex Problem* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) may irritate, the book will be found well worth reading. Mr. Ingram describes the different codes that have prevailed in regard to sex, and then has an excellent chapter ,"The Analysis Game", in which a group of young people express their views. It is in the emergence of a new type, represented by two of these, that Mr. Ingram sees the way of development. These two "relegate sex to the position of an incident": this view is a necessary condition of the progress of the race to a more intelligent standard. Extremely sound are these observations:

> In an ideal union the husband does not find his attention diverted from his work by sexual imagination. He is relieved of that because sex has become a natural incident, so normal and natural that in the ordinary duties of life there is no need to think about it. Many a man who has found himself in single life bothered by the usual sex obsessions, in a happy marriage discovers a complete relief. And that is due, not as many free

lovers suppose, to the increased opportunities for sexexpression, but to the fact that a happy marriage effectually provides an intelligent and social counter-balance to the sexual inclinations.

In the "Criterion Miscellanies" (Faber & Faber, 1s. each) we have Mrs. Mitchison's *Comments on Birth Control* and Mr. Christopher Dawson's **Christianity and Sex*. Many pious church-going folk ought to read Mrs. Mitchison if only to learn how sex problems are being talked about to-day; Mr. Dawson's is a sane and sober analysis which deserves careful study.

In the same series is Mr. Douglas Jerrold's *The Lie about the War*, which argues that recent war-books do not tell the truth about the War, or deal with the *actualities* of war. He believes that their picture of a four years' "unbroken sequence of sanguinary, futile, and purposeless horrors, debasing its participants", is both false and dangerous. The vigour of Mr. Jerrold's protest warns the reader that his feelings may be running away with him, and confidence is not increased when we find that "a few score of men of military age were put to death" is his idea of the massacre of St. Bartholomew!

The Doctor's Mission (Murray, 6s.) is a translation of a work by Dr. Erwin Liek of Danzic, which is now in its 7th German edition. Dr. Liek writes very frankly of the medical man's attitude to his work, and of the need for more conscience in it. He says there are far too many operations, often for the sake of the fees, and much useless publication of papers. He even has a kind word to say for the quack. Perhaps the most valuable chapter in the book is that in which he shows the evil effects on doctors and patients of medical insurance. We wonder if English experience is parallel to the German in this matter: recent references in the House of Commons suggest that it may be.

One need not be very old before one learns that doctors are very human and very fallible, but one is continually surprised by the ease with which medical fads become general. First it is the appendix, then it is teeth, then nasal septum, then sunlight treatment, and so forth.

Mr. J. Ellis Barker translates the book and writes a characteristic introduction against the frequence of operations. The translation might have been improved: surely Mr. Barker knows the correct title of the play he translates " Miss Cheney's End ".

Prof. Pierre Villey's *The World of the Blind* (Duckworth, 7s. 6d.), now translated from the French, is a revealing and fascinating volume. Blind from early childhood, M. Villey has not merely overcome all handicaps, but he has made himself one of the leading authorities on Montaigne, while he is now Professor of Literature at Caen University. The book is far more than the "psychological study" it is claimed to be, though psychologists will be specially interested in the chapters on how the blind conceive space. It discusses the use of Braille, the education of the blind and the blind-deaf, the " substitution of senses ", and the relation of the blind to games, travel, nature, art, poetry. Altogether it is a remarkable achievement and a contribution to the subject of peculiar authority.

Nowhere—neither in the title *Psycho-Analysis and Art* (Bale & Danielsson, 5s.) nor in any summary—does Mr. George Whitehead suggest the aim or the thesis of his book; nor is it easy to find by reading through its pages. There is a chapter, for example, on "Women and Anarchy", and another on "The Wonders of Intelligence", while Part IV is concerned with "The Psychology of the Penny Dreadful", and there is also much about Poor Law administration in boroughs controlled by Socialists. Still, it must be noted, the title is *Psycho-Analysis and Art*.

Had all Dr. W. J. Warner's *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution* (Longmans, 15s.) been written by the author there would have been a funeral ere this, and the *Congregational Quarterly* would be seeking a new editor. But fortunately there are many quotations, and after ploughing through sentence after sentence like "The problem of providing suitable literature for popular consumption was solved by undertaking an extensive programme of publication", we meet with refreshing sentences from Wesley or one of his preachers, as for example, Wesley's " If I leave behind me ten pounds . . . you and all mankind bear witness against me that I lived and died a thief and a robber".

Dr. Warner never uses a short word if a long one will do; he reminds us of Dr. Nares. It is a pity, for any amount of work has gone to the making of his book, which will be found to fill a gap in the literature of economic and religious history. The book brings out extremely well the early Methodist distrust of democracy—still plainly evident in the Wesleyan Methodists, though even they would not share the view of one of their forbears that "Methodism hates democracy as much as it hates sin". The Methodist attitude to money, trade, and commerce is also shown by ample quotation.

We may be conscious of its dangers, but we should be none the worse too for a little of the spirit of Henry Longden, who thus describes his habits:

> I therefore took for my motto, " not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord," and I determined to divide each day into certain portions . . . Accordingly, I rose at five, and spent an hour with God. From six to four I devoted to business, allowing myself frequently a few minutes of secret prayer. In which ten hours, besides managing my little business, I set myself to earn ten shillings; and this I did with great ease. From four to ten I made sacred to religious purposes. My business prospered more and more . . . I now had money to spare for the support of God's cause and for the relief of God's poor.

In *The Day Before Yesterday* (Williams & Norgate, 5s.) Dr. James Moffatt has given us an intensely interesting essay, although considerable force has been employed to make the last chapter fit into the scheme. The "day before yesterday" is the period from 1860 to 1890, and Dr. Moffatt surveys some of its features in literature with reference to faith and religion. Ibsen, Meredith, Matthew Arnold, R. L. S. and others furnish data, and as a result of it all we learn

> that the Christian religion has been under fire before now, that it has given way to panic as well as to over-confidence, that it has handicapped itself by adhering to outworn tactics and weapons, and that it has displayed recuperative powers which have been a surprise to its followers as well as to its opponents.

The letters of a magistrate edited by Father G. Callaway in *South Africa from Within* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.) are very fresh and readable. They put the colour question from a new angle, and they show us a man who regards his work in the same fine spirit as the school-mistress mentioned in the Editorial.

The New Hangman (Putnam, 10s. 6d., 2s. 6d., and 1s.) is a play by Mr. Laurence Housman written to drive home the case for the abolition of capital punishment.

W. H. T. G. To His Friends (S.P.C.K., 5s.) is a footnote to Miss Padwick's admirable biography, *Temple Gairdner of Cairo*. These letters cover a great variety of topics and reveal the same inspiring spirit we saw in the biography. At the end are criticisms of Dickens, R. L. S., Hardy, and H. G. Wells, and a study of Elgar's Second Symphony.

Dr. R. A. Millikan, son of one Congregational minister and brother-in-law of another, is perhaps the leading scientist in the United States. The papers in his *Science and the New Civilization* (Scribners, 7s. 6d.) reveal the reasons for the position he holds. There are technical papers which show the range of his scholarship, and there are popular papers which, by their clarity and apt illustration, show his gifts as a teacher. Dr. Millikan not only retains his Christian faith, but he believes that 95 per cent of the "altruistic and humanitarian and forward-looking work" done in the United States comes "directly or indirectly, from the influence of organized religion". The concluding paragraph of the book is the expression of a personal belief:

> "Personally, I believe that essential religion is one of the world's supremest needs, and I believe that one of the great contributions that the United States ever can, or ever will, make to world progress—greater by far than any contribution which we ever have made or ever can make to the science of government—will consist in *furnishing an example to the world of how the religious life of a nation can evolve intelligently, wholesomely, inspiringly, reverently, completely divorced from all unreason, all superstition, and all unwholesome emotionalism.*"

The Drift of Civilization (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) consists of contributions to the Fiftieth Anniversary number of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. Among the writers are Dr. Einstein, Sir Philip Gibbs, Dean Inge, Count Keyserling, Mr. J. B. S. Haldane, Prof. Stephen Leacock, Mr. Bertrand Russell, and Mr. H. G. Wells.

Dr. V. H. Rutherford's *War or Peace, England and America* (Williams & Norgate, 2s. 6d.) consists of 28 violent chapters (in 96 pp.) on all manner of political topics. We agree with Dr. Rutherford's anti-imperialism, but feel that he does his cause more harm than good.

Mr. Ludwell Denny's *America Conquers Britain* (Knopf, 12s. 6d.) is journalism *in excelsis*—over 400 pp. of it. So far from war between America and Britain being unthinkable, says Mr. Denny, it is more likely than war between America and any other Power, for "the causes which have produced other wars, and specifically British wars, are active in virulent form in Anglo-American relations now": that is to say, a state of economic war now exists, and the question is whether it will lead to political conflict, and then to "armed war". The economic war, we learn, can have only one result: neither Britain nor the world has any chance against America:

> "We were Britain's colony once. She will be our colony before she is done; not in name, but in fact. Machines gave Britain power over the world. Now better machines are giving America power over the world and Britain . . . We shall not make Britain's mistake. Too wise to try to govern the world, we shall merely own it. Nothing can stop us . . . If Britain is foolish enough to fight us, she will go down more quickly, that is all. Of course, American world supremacy is rather horrible to think about—quite unthinkable, as they say of an Anglo-American war. But American supremacy can hardly be worse than British and others gone before. Our weapons are money and machines. But the other nations of the world want money and machines. Our materialism, though not our power, is matched by theirs. That is why our conquest is so easy, so inevitable."

Mr. John W. Graham's "Merttens Lecture", *Britain and America* (Hogarth Press, 2s. 6d.) summarizes the history of the relationship between the two countries, and then outlines the various problems that have arisen since the War—the League, war debts, tariffs, naval disarmament, *etc.*

Mr. C. Delisle Burns's *Introduction to the Social Sciences* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) attempts a synthesis : "its purpose is to review the life of man in society, so that this subject-matter of many sciences may be seen to be one whole before any special study is begun".

The six papers in Dr. A. Chisholm's *The Dawning Epoch* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.) deal with social and economic questions, with the exception of the last, which is on "The Witness of Protestantism".

Points of View (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.) contains the addresses broadcast by Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, Dean Inge, Mr. H. G. Wells, Mr. J. B. S. Haldane, Sir Oliver Lodge, and Sir Walford Davies, together with Mr. Dickinson's Introduction and Summing Up.

Two of the new volumes in the attractive "English Heritage Series" (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) take us out into the open : Mr. Neville Cardus writes on *Cricket* in his usual delightful fashion, and we saunter about the countryside with Mr. Thomas Burke, calling now and then at *The English Inn.* Lest this kind of life spoil us we are given a sober volume to carry in our pockets, Sir Maurice Amos's *The English Constitution,* to which Lord Hewart contributes an Introduction.

In *Indian Neighbours* (S.C.M., 2s.) Miss M. L. Christlieb's skill in portraying village life in India is once more conspicuous.

Said Mr. Hugh Walpole to himself, "Priestley and I pulled it off very well in *Farthing Hall,* didn't we? But since then he's done *The Good Companions,* and got 10s. 6d. for it. If he, a mere tyro as a novelist, can do that, why shouldn't I?".

Of course, Mr. Walpole never said that, but nevertheless the one fault we have to find with *Rogue Herries* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.)—and the thing that prevents the book from ranking with Mr. Walpole's best—is that it contains unnecessary passages which could have been left out to the great advantage of the story, and of the buyer of books. We can learn about Rogue Herries and Mirabell, David and Sarah, without being reminded of the decay of agriculture, enclosures, and the budget of the agricultural labourer.

There is something reminiscent of the Forsytes in the ramifications of the Herries family, but there is a vigour of language and action which Mr. Galsworthy could never reach. Stirring indeed are some of the episodes in the life of Francis and David, while the atmosphere of the Lake Country broods over it all. The over-nice will be well advised to stick to Mr. Walpole's *The Cathedral* and *The Old Ladies,* but those who do not mind eighteenth century bluntness and its outspokenness about things not mentioned in polite society to-day will rejoice as they read and be duly grateful to Mr. Walpole.

Mr. Thornton Wilder's books are always "different", and *The Woman of Andros* (Longmans, 6s.) is no exception. It has all the elements of a Greek tragedy, though the first part is based on Terence's *Andria,* a comedy based in turn on two of Menander's lost plays. The story, though very short, is one of remarkable beauty, which is matched by the language in which it is told.

We have seen Miss Claire Spencer's *Gallows' Orchard* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) compared to *The House with the Green Shutters.* The comparison is scarcely fair to the new book, though the resemblances are obvious. Effie Gallows lives alone in a Scottish village. Her personality is so remarkable that the minister and the dominie, among others, offer to marry her. With child by one man, she marries another without telling him of her condition

—a fact entirely out of keeping with the rest of her character as portrayed in the book. How she paid and "dree'd her weird" the book relates: the villagers vented their wrath on somebody not of their kind, somebody who did not fit in with their scheme of things. Horrible in many ways, the book nevertheless has its beauties; we hope the writer will try her hand on a pleasanter theme.

In the *Congregational Quarterly* (III. 230) the Rev. W. Blackshaw wrote an article under the title "The Novelist as Preacher", in which he described the life and work of Gustav Frenssen, and reviewed a translation of some of Frenssen's sermons. We now have before us Frenssen's autobiographical novel, *Otto Babendiek* (Harrap, 10s.). Frenssen was born in Holstein in 1864. For eleven years he held a pastorate, leaving it at the age of 35 in order to write fiction, and he is now recognized as one of the leading German novelists. *Otto Babendiek,* like the rest of Frenssen's writings, is redolent of the land its author loves, though it covers the war years. It is a long novel, but it will afford a good introduction to Frenssen for those who have not met his work previously.

Madame Sigrid Undset who, still under fifty, won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1928, is represented this quarter by two translations. The first is *Jenny,* one of her earlier works, which now appears in the "Borzoi Pocket Books" (Knopf, 3s. 6d.). It is the story of how the President of the Immortals ended his sport with Jenny—incidentally a story of what happens when life has no religious basis.

The second is *Kristin Lavransdatter* (Knopf, 8s. 6d.), a bulky trilogy which contains *The Garland, The Mistress of Husaby,* and *The Cross.* While we can in no wise rise to the heights of eulogy with which some—among them Mr. Hugh Walpole—have greeted this book, yet we gladly acknowledge its power, both in its description of Norwegian life in the fourteenth century and in its portrayal of character. Kristin is a woman who will live, though she is by no means so uniformly attractive as Simon Andressön. The minor characters are well conceived and well wrought, too, while the description of the plague is horribly realistic. A non-Scandinavian reader is liable to lose himself in the family relationships and in the political passages, but nobody will stop reading the book because of this difficulty. We read to the end with sustained interest, as a proof of which we may say there is a misprint on p. 819.

Another translation from the Norwegian is Arne Garborg's *Peace* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), a psychological novel which is in essence the description and analysis of a sufferer from religious mania. We hope that this volume will be followed by translations of the novels dealing with Enok Haave's sons.

EDITOR.

Books on Evolution are often spoilt by technicality, and by a dreariness of form like nothing else in literature. Psychology is as good as ruined for ordinary men by what Hazlitt would have called its "Babylonish dialect". But Dr. H. F. Standing's **Spirit in Evolution* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) is clear of these faults. You need not be a Fellow of the Royal Society in order to understand it. What it outlines is the trend of evolution from the first beginnings of life, on and upward to the summits of human personality and of the spirit's insight into Divine things. It is the work of an experienced biologist and psychologist; and of one who holds the mystical faith of the Quaker school. The book is full of points; it is luminous in its treatment of Nature, and it has valuable illustrations.

The author's argument is that the whole evolutionary process is fundamentally an expression of divine purpose and activity. Those who are thinking out the relation of science to the ultimate matters of the soul, will find this a very helpful book.

A volume of Lenten sermons on the Resurrection is issued by the Rev. Robert Norwood, of New York, under the title *His Glorious Body* (Scribners, 7s. 6d.). The sermons accept the fact of the empty tomb as recorded in the Gospels. In the main they are an interpretation on this basis of the great Pauline passages on the risen Christ and the future life. The author is awake to the times. His book is valuable for an attractive spiritual insight and devotional warmth. But 7s. 6d. is rather a lot for 230 pages: at least, it is for English ministers!

Professor Ray Dotterer, of Franklin and Marshall College, U.S.A., calls his *Philosophy by way of the Sciences* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) an introductory text-book. It is much better than that, if pleasure in reading it is a fair test. The summary of the sciences is carefully done; and so are the outlines of philosophy, though each system in turn collapses. Prof. Dotterer is an emporium of knowledge, and he writes with something of a dry academic humour. About his own position I am not sure: he seems to believe in "emergent mechanism", and to be wishing all the time he could believe in something better. I conclude that a satisfactory philosophy is shy of the postulates of science. In the issue we are told that there is a God, finite, and the good-will of the universe: if you ask what amount of good-will the universe has, the answer is "not too much"; but there is a fair amount, *e.g.*, in yourself and your fellow men. At the same time Prof. Dotterer has to admit that it might disappear! What then becomes of God? We are to maintain an attitude of "logical caution"; and at any rate, "to act as if we knew a great deal more than any one can possibly know about most questions of human interest". So the mountain produces a mouse. After reading the whole 450 pages of Prof. Dotterer's very clever book, I am going back to the New Testament again, as a much more promising solution of life's manifold problems—"In Him was life, and the life was the light of men".

Some time ago I read Mr. Edmond Holmes's *Self-Realization,* a bit of his characteristic mysticism; in the present volume, *Philosophy without Metaphysics* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) he gives us a philosophy of unreserved intuitionism. So much of what Mr. Holmes writes carries an assent that one wishes he kept a firmer hand on himself. You get nervous when he "settles" Mr. Bradley in fifty pages, and destroys Prof. Alexander in very little more. But Mr. Holmes will have nothing to do with metaphysics: it is the great impostor. Still, you cannot support the mind wholly on paradoxes, however good they are. We do want to bring our thought, as well as our life, "into harmony with the inner truth of things". The waters of wisdom, Mr. Holmes says, are slumbering in the dark recesses of the soul: the "something evermore about to be" is, he says, the thing that really is. One feels an essential truth in all this, and not very far from the kingdom of God. And yet—perhaps in his next book Mr. Holmes will fly a little nearer the ground.

As an offset to the prevalent pessimism Dr. Charles Ellwood's *Man's Social Destiny* (S.C.M., 5s.) is a welcome study of the social outlook in the light of science. Dr. Ellwood is Professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri. The hope of the future seems to him to turn on science becoming more humanistic, and on the escape of Christianity from its theological toils into the freer atmosphere of a life. The best chapter is

on the future of education. Dr. Ellwood thinks we are not educated: probably he is right. A useful and reliable book.

The Rev. Walter S. Bowdon's *Re-Interpretations* (Skeffington, 4s. 6d.) presents old beliefs "from the point of view of modern thought". It is introduced by the Bishop of Liverpool, and Sir Oliver Lodge. Mr. Bowdon is quite able to stand on his own feet. Some of the things he says seem a curious blend of the antique and the novel; but he is straightforward, and obviously sincere, and I have no doubt his book will be helpful to many who cannot see their way. A. T. S. JAMES.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS.

This quarter has seen some notable reprints: rarely have we had a more welcome list for those with limited purses. First come the 4th eds. of FORSYTH's *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (Indep. Press, 3s. 6d.) and of HERRMANN's *The Communion of the Christian with God* (Williams & Norgate, 6s.), and the 2nd of Dr. W. R. MATTHEWS's *The Gospel and the Modern Mind* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.), and FATHER W. L. KNOX's *Meditation and Mental Prayer* (Allan, 3s. 6d.) The one volume eds. of *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page* (Heinemann, 5s.), *The Letters of Gertrude Bell* (Benn, 8s. 6d.), and the *Collected Verse of Robert Service* (Benn, 8s. 6d.) are sure to be warmly received. The same is true of Prof. G. M. TREVELYAN's *Clio, A Muse* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.), which contains new essays on "John Bunyan," "History and Fiction" and "The Present Position of History," and of KATHERINE MANSFIELD's *Poems* (Constable, 6s.). We are glad that CAREY and SCOTT's *Outline History of the Great War, for use in Schools* (Cambridge Press, 6s.), has gone to a 2nd ed. Mr. H. G. WELLS's *The Open Conspiracy* (Hogarth Press, 5s.) is "A Second Version, made more explicit and plain"; Mr. E. ROY CALVERT's *Capital Punishment in the 20th Century* (Putnam, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), has come out in a 4th rev. ed. in view of the Commission on the subject; and we have a 3rd imp. of HOMER LANE's *Talks to Parents and Teachers* (Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d.). The Jubilee Ed. of CROCKETT's *Satchel Guide to Europe* (Allen and Unwin, 20s.), comes very seasonably.

M. ST. CLARE BRYNE. *The Elizabethan Home.* Cobden-Sanderson. 5s. Reprinted from the entertaining contemporary Dialogues of Claudius Hollyband and Peter Erondell.

The Spirit of Adventure and *Everyman in a World of Wonder.* Study Outlines, based on material in Adult School Lesson Handbooks. (N.A.S.U. 6d. each.)

R. DUNKERLEY. *The Oxyrhynchus Gospel Fragments.* Author. 1s. Reprinted from the *Harvard Theol. Review.*

ALSO RECEIVED.

C. BOUTFLOWER. *The Book of Isaiah, cc.* 1-39. S.P.C.K. 16s.

J. H. HERTZ [Ed.] *Genesis:* Hebrew Text, Eng. translation, and Commentary. Oxford Press. 7s. 6d.

J. KENNEDY [Ed. by N. LEVISON.] *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the O.T.* Clark. 10s. 6d.

Isaiah, 1-39. Translated into Colloquial English by Dr. J. B. ALLAN. N.A.S.U. 6d.

H. E. BRYANT. *New Light on an Old Letter.* Epworth Press. 8d. A new translation of 2 *Cor.*

The Study Bible: *Exodus* to *Ruth* (Expositions by Dr. G. JACKSON and Dr. D. C. SIMPSON); *Samuel* to *Esther* (Expositions by Prof. J. COATES and Dr. W. L. WARDLE). Cassell. 3s. 6d.

BASIL MATHEWS. *Jesus and Youth.* Vol. III. Pilgrim Press. 2s. 6d.

C. FISKE. *Calvary To-day.* S.C.M. 3s. Addresses by the Bishop of Central New York on the Words from the Cross.

H. MONTAGUE DALE. *Worship and Communion.* S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.

J. HAY COLLIGAN. *What was Jesus Like?* Stockwell. 2s. 6d.

RENDEL HARRIS. *Rutupiæ; The Gold Coast; Way-marks; Tenedos.* Heffer. 2s. each.

H. T. SHERLOCK. *The Wyrley Stones.* Heffer. 3s. 6d.

R. A. BUSH. *Sweet Corn from Heaven.* Two Worlds Pub. Co. 3s. 6d.

H. COOK. *The Call of the Church.* Kingsgate Press. 1s. 6d.

W. J. CAREY. *Fellowship in Reality.* S.P.G. 1s.

CARL HEATH. *The Free Spirit.* Friends' Book Centre. 3s.

W. T. BUSHROD. *The Sunday School and its Story.* Lindsey Press. 6d.

JOHN-BAPTIST REEVES. *The Dominicans.* Sheed & Ward. 2s. 6d.

The Life of a Modern University. Edited by HUGH MARTIN. S.C.M. 2s. Among the writers of chapters are Profs. J. J. FINDLAY, A. J. GRANT, H. J. W. HETHERINGTON, and Sir C. GRANT ROBERTSON.

JOHN WILD. *Selections from Spinoza;* R. MCKEON. *Selections from Medieval Philosophers:* I. Augustine to Albert the Great. Scribners. 3s. 6d. each.

C. H. BROOKS. *Your Character from Your Handwriting.* Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

J. M. HOLZMAN. *Pacifist Imperialism.* Williams & Norgate. 3s. 6d.

PAMPHLETS, ETC.

E. J. PRICE. *The Reality of God.* Indep. Press. 3d. "Great Doctrines in a New Setting" series.

H. HENSLEY HENSON. *Church and State in England.* S.P.C.K. 6d.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn Review (April). The editorial notes deal with R. W. Dale, Mark Guy Pearse, and Dr. R. F. Horton. The chief articles are Dr. C. G. Montefiore's "The Achievement of the Old Testament", the Rev. N. Levison's rather biased "The Present Situation in Palestine", and the Rev. E. B. Storr's "The Problem of Sunday".

The Hibbert Journal (April). An anonymous Russian writes on "Russian Communism as a New Religion." Sir John Marriott, in "The Dignity of Labour," examines Dr. Jacks's well-known views on the subject: he maintains that it is impossible to banish the "sordid" occupations in this country unless 50 per cent of the population emigrate. Kindred topics are treated in Mr. S. S. Fleisher's "Art and Recreation," which describes the Graphic Sketch Club, Philadelphia, an institution approved by Dr. Jacks. Of other articles the most interesting are Dr. Vincent Taylor's "The Mandaeans and the Fourth Gospel," Prof. Thwing's "Growth of Institutions in the United States," Dr. Miall Edwards's "Religion as a Value-Experience," and Prof. Dawes Hicks's "Survey of Recent Philosophical Literature".

The London Quarterly (April). Dr. J. A. Faulkner writes on "Wesley The Mystic", Mr. E. C. Dewick on "Some Tendencies Among Indian Students To-day", Dr. Garvie on "The Law of Love", the Rev. L. D. Weatherhead on "Health and Religion", Miss A. M. Evans on "Post-War Russia", and the Rev. C. J. Wright on "The Necessity of Theology."

The Baptist Quarterly (April). Mr. G. H. Shakespeare, M.P., writes on "The Persecution of Baptists in Russia," the Rev. John Pitts on "The Problem of Free Will", Dr. Townley Lord on "Some Modern Views of the Soul" and

Mr. W. S. Samuel on " Charles-Marie de Veil," described as " Jew, Catholic, canon regular of St. Augustine, prior of Ste-Genevieve, Huguenot, Anglican clergyman, Baptist minister".

The Modern Churchman (March—May). Controversy with Anglo-Catholics is prominent, a notable contribution being the Rev. J. S. Bezzant's " Anglo-Catholicism and Infallibility." The Rev. J. P. Hodges talks of Modernism in the Work of a Parish, while there is a translation of Dr. Maurice Goguel's "The Jesus of History and the Christ of Faith".

The Church Quarterly Review (April). Dr. T. H. Robinson has a thoughtful article on " The Death of Christ—Its Significance in the Light of the World's Religions," and the Rev. C. Reeves Palmer a study of Pierre de Bérulle under the title of " A Master of Mystical Theology." There is a very important article by the Bishop of Gloucester on " The Christian Ministry", while Dr. Oesterley reviews Dr. Charles's Commentary on *Daniel*.

The Expository Times (April—June). The expositions of the " Words from the Cross " are by Rev. H. L. Simpson, Dr. J. G. Simpson, and Dr. Thomas Yates. Worth reading are Dr. Raven's " God and Mr. Middleton Murry," Dr. A. Herbert Gray's " Marriage," and Mrs. Robertson's " Religion and the Drama".

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Fourth Month). Mr. H. G. Wood, Mr. Donald Gray, Mr. Edgar B. Castle, and Mr. T. C. Elliott discuss " The Problem of Youth in the Society of Friends." Mr. Wood also writes on " Woodbrooke and the Society of Friends " and Mr. Carl Heath on the Society's " Historical Contribution." Among other contributors are Dr. O'Brien Harris and Mr. Edward Grubb.

The Review of the Churches (April). " The Sunday Question " is discussed here also, the contributor being Dr. Gillie. Dr. Brilioth writes on " The Religious Situation in Northern Europe", and Sir Henry Lunn on " The Free Churches and Episcopacy". Mr. Basil Mathews's subject is " The Present Crisis in Empire", and Dr. Otto's " The Common Tasks of Protestantism". We regret to read that Sir Henry Lunn is laying down the editorship.

The British Journal of Inebriety (April). The articles are Dr. William Brown's important "The Rôle of Psychotherapy in the Prevention and Treatment of Alcoholism and Other Drug Addictions," and Mr. C. J. Bond's " Family Council Law and the Inebriate." The books reviewed are far from being strictly limited to the subject of the journal.

The International Review of Missions (April). Dr. Kohnstamm discusses " The Necessity for a New Philosophy and Its Bearing on Missionary Work " and Dr. W. ten Boom, "Zionism." There is an important article by Dr. Macnicol on " India To-day ", and another by Dr. Kraemer on " Christianity and Secularism".

World Dominion (April). This journal is again packed with short articles describing missionary enterprise in all parts of the world. Its attitude is well stated in the following words:—

> Christian men and women who are appalled at the slow progress which is being made in world evangelization should determine:
>
> 1 That they will not countenance the formation of new Societies.
>
> 2 That they will demand that societies in which they are interested shall pool their experience and co-ordinate their efforts with other like-minded missions.
>
> 3 That all societies which they support shall shape policies in harmony with New Testament principles, and that in spending money they will think to scale—the scale of the world.

The Evangelical Quarterly (April). The main articles are Sir Ambrose Fleming's " Modern Cosmogony," Dr. Keyser's " The Reasonableness of a Special Divine Relation," Dr. Mackay's " Paul's Great Doxology ", and Dr. J. C. Rullmann's " Past and Present of the Reformed Churches in Holland."

The Yale Review (Spring). M. André Siegfried asks "Will Europe Be Americanized?" and Mr. R. H. Mottram tells of his experiences "After the Somme." There is a characteristic article by Mr. H. M. Tomlinson on "War Books," in which Mr. Winston Churchill's *History of the War* is described as "eloquence, in an Eton collar on Speech Day." Most people will turn first to Mr. C. F. Andrews's article on "Gandhi and Indian Reforms," though Mr. Louis Fischer's "Bolshevik Foreign Policy" is also very good.

The Review and Expositor (Bapt., Louisville, Kentucky, April). The Revs. H. J. Flowers and A. D. Belden continue their race for the greatest number of articles in foreign periodicals. Another English contributor is Dr. W. T. Whitley. A very fresh contribution is Dr. Phelps's "The Martha Heresy", which may be specially commended to women.

The Anglican Theological Review (April). Dr. Easton's Notes and Comments are always a feature. The main articles are Dr. H. H. Gowen's "The Name," Dr. T. L. Harris's "The Spiritual Value of Marriage", and the Rev. G. C. Lund's "The Modern Liturgical Movement in German Protestanism".

The Biblical Review (April, Biblical Seminary, New York). Dr. Wyckoff writes on "Modern Humanism", Dr. Arthur J. Brown on "The Practical Value of Church History," and Mr. H. R. Monro on "The Evangelical Witness of Hymnology," while there is an informing article by Dr. E. V. Wills on "Religious Education in the German Elementary School of the Reformation Period." Specially serviceable in this journal is "The Review of Current Thought and Activity".

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE MORAL INFALLIBILITY OF JESUS.

Sir,—If I may be allowed a last word without incurring the charge of contentiousness, I should like to draw attention to an unfortunate misprint in my reply to Mr. Martin in your April issue. Whether I or the printers are responsible, I do not know. If I am, I apologize.

On p. 253, l. 14, in the paragraph dealing with our Lord's possible belief in eternal punishment, the word "never" has been omitted before "reaching". Any readers who are interested might care to note.

Lastly, the *Gospel according to the Hebrews,* for which Mr. Martin says our oldest authority is Jerome (late fourth century), is, as a matter of fact, quoted by Eusebius (early fourth century), Origenes (early third century), and Clemens of Alexandria (about 200 A.D.). It was also used by Hegesippos (about 180 A.D.) and probably also Ignatius (about 115 A.D.). According to Harnack, its probable limits of date are 65—110 A.D. Once more, to use Mr. Martin's own words, "Let us face facts".

Yours truly, C. J. CADOUX.

Sir,—As you are aware, my rejoinder to Dr. Cadoux had to be written at short notice. I regret that I expressed myself inaccurately about the *Gospel according to the Hebrews.* What I had in mind, however—and this alone is pertinent to the discussion—is that the particular saying to which Dr. Cadoux attaches importance is first found in Jerome. (See Dr. James's *Apocryphal N.T.* p. 6). It is not of much value to discuss the date of this Gospel as a whole, when it is only known to us in quotations and references dating from different periods. Some of the sayings it ascribes to Jesus are much more credible than others, apart altogether from the date and character of the man who quotes them. This one with its note of moral hesitation ill accords with the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels. If it could be traced back to the first century I should still feel that it did not justify the use Dr. Cadoux makes of it. A. D. MARTIN.